

MAY 4/33

The SOUTH ATLANTIC QUARTERLY

*7A

• • •
APRIL, 1935

The Monroe Doctrine from Roosevelt to Roosevelt

David Y. Thomas

The Utopian Novel in America, 1888-1900

Robert L. Shurter

The Good Samaritan of St. Helena Island

Mason Crum

Napoleon II

George Matthew Dutcher

Malthusianism and the Debate on Slavery

J. J. Spengler

Public Benefits of Private Profits

Walter J. Matherly

Wild-Heart: An Appreciation of Emily Jane Brontë

Ralph Aiken

Robert E. Lee

William K. Boyd

Book Reviews

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY FOR
THE SOUTH ATLANTIC PUBLISHING COMPANY
BY THE DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS
DURHAM, N. C., U. S. A.

The South Atlantic Quarterly

FOUNDED IN 1902 BY THE 9019 SCHOLARSHIP SOCIETY OF TRINITY COLLEGE

OFFICERS

Robert L. Flowers, Pres. Albert M. Webb, Vice-Pres. D. W. Newsom, Sec.-Treas.

DIRECTORS

W. P. Few, Wm. H. Glason, R. L. Flowers, Wm. H. Wannamaker, D. W. Newsom, W. K. Boyd

Editorial Board: William H. Wannamaker William T. Laprade

Newman I. White and Calvin B. Hoover

Managing Editor: Henry R. Dwire

Communications in regard to articles, book reviews and editorial matters should be addressed to Managing Editor, SOUTH ATLANTIC QUARTERLY, Duke University, Durham, N. C. While reasonable diligence is observed, the return of unsolicited manuscripts is not guaranteed. Subscriptions and all communications relating to advertisements and business matters should be addressed to Duke University Press, Durham, N. C. The Cambridge University Press, Fetter Lane, London, E.C. 4; agents in Great Britain and Ireland. Subscription rates on application.

IN THIS ISSUE

PAGE

THE MONROE DOCTRINE FROM ROOSEVELT TO ROOSEVELT.....	David Y. Thomas	117
THE UTOPIAN NOVEL IN AMERICA, 1888-1900..	Robert L. Shurter	137
THE GOOD SAMARITAN OF ST. HELENA ISLAND....	Mason Crum	145
NAPOLEON II.....	George Matthew Dutcher	154
MALTHUSIANISM AND THE DEBATE ON SLAVERY....	J. J. Spengler	179
PUBLIC BENEFITS OF PRIVATE PROFITS.....	Walter J. Matherly	191
WILD-HEART: AN APPRECIATION OF EMILY JANE BRONTË.....	Ralph Aiken	202
ROBERT E. LEE.....	William K. Boyd	211
COMMENTS OF BOOKS:		
Letters of Gamaliel Bradford.....	Alan K. Manchester	220
A Book Worth Reading.....	John J. Corson, III	221
Fascinating Reading.....	Olav K. Lundeberg	223
Norwegian Nationalism.....	Olav K. Lundeberg	224
Teaching of Foreign Languages.....	Olav K. Lundeberg	224
John Keats.....	Newman I. White	226
Byron Explained Again.....	Newman I. White	228
Early Nineteenth-Century Reviewers.....	Newman I. White	231
Slang.....	Clarence Gohdes	233
A Biography with Charm.....	E. C. Knowlton	234
Early Maryland.....	R. H. Woody	235

Contents of previous issues of South Atlantic Quarterly can be found by consulting the INTERNATIONAL INDEX in your library.

Issued in the Months of January, April, July, and October.

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Postoffice at Durham, N. C.

Copyright, 1935, by Duke University Press

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

DAVID Y. THOMAS holds degrees from Emory, Vanderbilt and Columbia universities and is head of the Department of History and Political Science in the University of Arkansas. He has written several books and numerous articles on historical subjects. His first contribution to THE SOUTH ATLANTIC QUARTERLY was made in 1907, and he has made several since then. He was president of the Southwestern Social Science Association in 1931.

ROBERT L. SHURTER is a graduate of Amherst College (1928), has Master of Arts degree from Columbia University, and is at present a candidate for a Ph.D. at Western Reserve University. He is making a study of the Utopian Novel in America centering around Edward Bellamy. For the past five years he has been a member of the English Department of Case School of Applied Science.

MASON CRUM, Wofford College, B.A.; Vanderbilt, School of Religion; Harvard, Philosophy; University of South Carolina, Ph.D. in Education. At the present time he is Assistant Professor of Biblical Literature in Duke University. He is the author of The Project Method in Religious Education, A Guide to Religious Pageantry, and magazine articles in the field of religious education.

GEORGE MATTHEW DUTCHER has been Professor of History in Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut, since 1901. At present he is a member of the Connecticut Tercentenary Commission and chairman of its committee on historical publications. His Political Awakening of the East (1925) was based on observations during a tour around the world.

J. J. SPENGLER, Ph.D., Ohio State University, is Associate Professor of Economics in Duke University. He is a frequent contributor to economic, sociological, and other professional journals, and has occasionally contributed articles to Scribner's, The American Mercury, and The New Republic.

WALTER J. MATHERLY, B.A., William Jewell College; M.A., Washington University; Fellow in Economics, University of Minnesota; Associate Professor of Business Administration, University of North Carolina 1920-23, Professor 1923-26; Professor of Economics and Dean of the College of Commerce and Journalism, University of Florida, since 1926. He is a member of the American Economic Association, Southeastern Economic Association, Social Science Research Council, and Florida State Chamber of Commerce.

RALPH AIKEN was born in New Orleans in 1892. At the age of thirteen he read Wuthering Heights, became enthralled by it and imbued with a life-long admiration of its author. Mr. Aiken, engaging in various businesses from advertising to house-building, is also a writer of magazine articles and one novel, The Ghost Hunters.

WILLIAM KENNETH BOYD is Professor of History in Duke University and a distinguished scholar in American history. He is the author of The Story of Durham: City of the New South and other works.

SO LITTLE... SO LOVABLE



and so dependent on you

WHAT excitement there was when she got her first tooth. And her second! And now there are seven. Already she is making brave attempts to say a word or two.

Much of your life is given over to keeping her well and happy. For she is so little and lovable—and so dependent on you.

During the day and through the darkness of night you have a feeling of safety and security because of the telephone. It is an ever-watchful guardian of your home—

ready to serve you in the ordinary affairs of life and in time of emergency.

In office and store and factory and on the farm the telephone is an equally important part of every activity.

The telephone would not be what it is today if it were not for the nation-wide Bell System. Its unified plan of operation has developed service to its present high efficiency and brought it within reach of people everywhere.



An extension telephone in your bedroom, sun room, kitchen or nursery will save many steps each day. It insures greater safety and privacy yet the monthly charge is small.

BELL TELEPHONE SYSTEM

The South Atlantic Quarterly

Vol. XXXIV

APRIL, 1935

Number 2

THE MONROE DOCTRINE FROM ROOSEVELT TO ROOSEVELT

DAVID Y. THOMAS

THE world was somewhat startled in 1904 by the interpretation given to the Monroe Doctrine by President Theodore Roosevelt; it was hardly less surprised, but very much gratified, by the change made in our foreign policy by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1933.

Professor Albert Bushnell Hart once said that "to the statesman, the editor, the orator and the writer of magazine articles the phrase 'Monroe Doctrine' appears often like 'that blessed word Mesopotamia,' which so comforted and invigorated the poor old mother in Israel." On the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of "that blessed word" an advertisement appeared in *The New York Times* in which it was claimed that the Monroe Doctrine was "as binding upon America as is our God-inspired Constitution," and Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy was quoted as saying: "I believe strictly in the Monroe Doctrine, in our Constitution, and in the laws of God." The name of the Americans who bend the knee before this ikon, the Monroe Doctrine, could almost be said to be legion. The most popular place for reverence is the United States Senate. Professor Hiram Bingham once wrote a book about the Monroe Doctrine, which he called an *Obsolete Shibboleth*, but when he entered the Senate he also bowed the knee before the ikon.

Among the Latin Americans there have been a few admirers, such as Senator Ellis of Brazil and President Leguía

of Peru. On the occasion of Mr. Hoover's goodwill trip to South America the latter was the only official who took advantage of the opportunity to mention the Monroe Doctrine, but we know that he and his son had good reason to be grateful to American bankers. The unpopularity of the Monroe Doctrine in Central and South America is proverbial, and numerous publicists in Latin America could be quoted in condemnation of it, extending over a number of years. Señor Felix Porta of Cuba thought that the Monroe Doctrine should give place to Pan Americanism, and Dr. Baltasar Brum, sometime President of Uruguay and a great admirer of President Wilson, proposed to transform it into a defensive alliance. In recent years several have declared that it should be scrapped. Among the newspapers *La Prensa* of Buenos Aires has been a consistent enemy for many years, and in 1929 and again in 1930 declared that it was dead. Even *El Mercurio* of Santiago said that it should be discarded. Shortly after President Hoover was inaugurated a Cuban paper asked him to revise it.

No one man or set of men should be credited with transforming the Monroe Doctrine into an ikon, but President Cleveland and his Secretary of State, Richard Olney, probably had more to do with consecrating it than any other two men. Even then, however, the irreverent were ready to throw stones at it. As early as 1900 John B. Henderson declared that it had outlived its original meaning, and six years later Professor John W. Burgess, then lecturing in Berlin, said that the Monroe Doctrine was obsolete and nearly useless. Since then numerous publicists, among them Professor J. W. Garner, Mr. Irwin Cobb, Dr. Raymond Leslie Buell, and Professor John B. Whitton, have stood for modification, for going back to the original, or for outright abandonment. The latest man of prominence to abandon the cult is Senator Key Pittman, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. On returning from the London Economic Conference in 1933 he announced that the time had come for scrapping it. "The cause for the promulgation of the Monroe Doctrine no longer

exists," said he; "therefore it no longer serves a useful purpose. On the contrary, this ancient doctrine is a source of annoyance in many parts of Central and South America, with whose people we are on the friendliest terms. Annulment of the Monroe Doctrine would stimulate the friendship that already exists and be to the mutual advantage of both countries."

In the brief time since Senator Pittman delivered this pronouncement we have traveled far toward the end he had in view, the restoration of friendly relations with Latin America, but not by the exact route he indicated, as the sequel will show. But first let us see just what the Monroe Doctrine was—or is—and follow some of the developments concerned with it in recent years.

The Monroe Doctrine as announced by President Monroe in 1823 contained three distinct elements: (1) the American continents are not open to any further colonization by European powers; (2) any attempt on the part of European powers to impose their system of government, which is monarchical and sustained, when necessary, by intervention, will be looked upon as "dangerous to our peace and safety"; (3) our policy is "not to interfere in the internal concerns of any" of the European powers, "to consider the government *de facto* as the legitimate government for us"; and "to cultivate friendly relations with it." The first part of the third principle—"not to interfere in the internal concerns of any" of the European powers—is of no consequence to the Latin American countries except as they are interested in the general peace of the world. With all the rest they are vitally concerned. Except for a few incidents they looked with favor upon the Monroe Doctrine as beneficial to themselves up until the close of the nineteenth century. Most of the time since then they have regarded it, with its "corollaries" added from time to time, with increasing fear and distrust. Why the change?

The forcing of the Platt Amendment (1901) upon Cuba and the announcement of the Roosevelt corollary (1904) were approximately the beginning of evil days for the Monroe Doc-

trine. The former made of Cuba against her will a virtual protectorate of the United States. In the latter President Theodore Roosevelt announced that "chronic wrongdoing, or an impotence which results in the general loosening of the ties of civilized society," that is, failure to maintain order and pay debts, might "force the United States . . . to the exercise of an international police power." The attempt of European powers to collect debts in Venezuela and Santo Domingo led him to announce that, since we would not allow them to collect their own debts through fear that they might occupy American territory in violation of the Monroe Doctrine, then we ought to collect the debts for them. Hence the appointment of customs receivers in the Dominican Republic (1905) and Haiti (1915). If the lives and property of American citizens were endangered, the country of their domicile was not meeting its international obligations; so American marines must be sent to maintain order and reform the government. Out of this was evolved the Coolidge corollary that, if we did not allow European powers to protect their own nationals in Latin America, we must do it for them. More than once Great Britain has recognized this corollary, and in the summer of 1933 she and Spain both called on Mr. Sumner Welles to put it into practice in Cuba.

Writers on the Monroe Doctrine have not given due attention to the general policy as set forth by Monroe—"not to interfere in the internal concerns" of European powers; "to consider the *de facto* government as the legitimate government for us; to cultivate friendly relations with it." When Monroe wrote this, he probably had only Europe in mind, but there is evidence to show that he intended to apply the same policy to America.

As for a policy of recognition, any nation born of a revolution, as was the United States, could not consistently refuse to recognize the right of any people to change their government in the same way, a method sanctioned, with certain qualifications, in the Declaration of Independence. In following out this principle Jefferson simply asked whether, in the

case of France in the Republic of 1793, the new government represented the will of the people and seemed to be reasonably stable. This policy was followed with no great variation until after the Civil War. In 1877 President Hayes added that the new government—having in mind the Díaz government of Mexico—should “manifest a disposition to adhere to the obligations of treaties and international friendship.” Secretaries Evarts and Blaine emphasized this idea, and they, along with Hayes, laid the foundations for the policy of recognition and control of governments so as “greatly [to] affect the interests of certain American citizens.” The case of the speedy recognition of Panama is too well known to need more than mention. When General Dávila seized the government of Honduras in 1907, he sought “to impress upon American capitalists . . . the proper sense of security as to the money they invest for the development and improvement of the country.” Recognition followed a few weeks later. If, in order to get a government which would meet its international obligation, it was necessary to force out one and set up another, that was only a matter of detail, for example, in Nicaragua and Haiti. President Wilson added legal and moral qualifications, refusing to recognize any one who had come to power through a *coup d' état* or violence, or one whose hands were “stained with blood,” a policy in which he was not always consistent. As a price of recognition Secretary Hughes demanded of Obregón (Mexico, 1923) a treaty promising to meet international obligations, and the Central American states were induced to sign a treaty refusing to recognize revolutionary governments. Thus far had we departed from the original Monroe policy of recognition when Franklin D. Roosevelt became President. He soon reverted to the Monroe policy in Europe when he recognized the Soviet government in Russia, which had been *de facto* for nearly sixteen years. In America, however, he pleaded the Central American treaty, which we had not signed but had been supporting in practice, as an excuse for refusing to recognize the Martínez government in El Salvador. After having recognized promptly the

revolutionary government of Céspedes in Cuba, he held up for a time recognition of the Martín régime. No definite policy of recognition has yet been announced. The policy in regard to interference will be taken up later.

When the peacemakers assembled at Paris in 1919 came to the making of the Covenant of the League of Nations, President Wilson declared that the Monroe Doctrine had been made world wide in Article X, which proposed to guarantee independence and territorial integrity to each member nation. On the other hand, a loud outcry was raised in America that he had scrapped that ancient idol and that the United States should never enter the League until it was safeguarded. In the hope of satisfying opponents President Wilson, very much against his better judgment, prepared Article XXI. It reads: "Nothing in this covenant shall be deemed to affect the validity of international engagements, such as treaties of arbitrations or regional understandings like the Monroe Doctrine, for the securing the maintenance of peace." The opposition to this was very spirited, both in Europe and Latin America. Some thought that incorporation of the article would be equivalent to recognizing the hegemony of the United States and endorsing her policy of intervention. Señor Bonilla of Honduras asked that the Monroe Doctrine be defined in the Covenant. Although there was no probability that Mexico would soon be asked to join, Carranza let it be known that he did not recognize the Monroe Doctrine. China feared that Japan would claim recognition for a similar policy in Asia, and proposed to circumvent this by simply recognizing that the Monroe Doctrine was not incompatible with the obligations of the League. France saw in Wilson's proposal a weakening of the guarantees in Articles X and XVI. But President Wilson's prestige and eloquence bore down all opposition, and Article XXI was adopted against the better judgment of every one, all in the hope of overcoming the opposition of the United States Senate. A vain hope.

Article XXI was soon to be tested out. Already, when the peace conference was assembling, Bolivia had let it be known

that she was going to claim an outlet to the sea—Tacna-Arica. A year later she asked the help of the United States in securing this, whereupon Peru decided to present her claims to the Council of the League of Nations, a new force in world affairs then holding its first session. In February Bolivia formally laid her claims to Arica before the Council. The United States then warned her not to attack Peru, and asked Chile to avert the controversy. The Council was puzzled, since it now seemed doubtful if the United States would join the League, postponed the consideration of the boundary dispute, and nearly a year later, after a heated debate, postponed its decision. The troublesome question was whether, considering the Monroe Doctrine as reserved in Article XXI, it could handle American disputes. Chile had already notified the Council that she would quit the League if Bolivia's demand was granted, and now declared that the Monroe Doctrine would not allow the League to consider the matter at all. Bolivia stated that she had referred the matter to Washington before making the demand and had been assured that mediation by the League was not incompatible with the Monroe Doctrine.¹ The Council then referred the matter to three jurists, Signor Sciolata of Italy, Señor Manuel Peranto of Costa Rica, and Professor A. H. Struycken of Holland, while Chile chose three of her own, MM. Dupuis, Fauchille, and Weis. The Chilean commission gave the answer desired, that the League should not, because of Article XXI and the attitude of the United States, take cognizance of any American dispute over the opposition of a single American state. The League's commission reported that, "in its present form, the request of Bolivia is not in order, because the assembly cannot of itself modify any treaty. Modification of treaties lies wholly within the competence of the contracting parties." Chile had won on both counts, and next day Bolivia withdrew her demand with a reservation of the right to present it later.

¹ If any such assurance was ever received, it must have been in person from Secretary Lansing. The State Department reported that a search of the files in 1933 failed to reveal any correspondence relating to this subject. (Letter of November 10.)

Other things affecting Article XXI followed one after another. When El Salvador was invited to join the League, she turned to Washington and asked for a definition of the Monroe Doctrine. A few months before this, President Wilson had confessed that he had not been able to find a satisfactory definition, but perhaps El Salvador had not heard of his confession. Naturally Secretary Lansing was non-plused. After considerable delay he referred El Salvador to the President's speeches, especially the one delivered before the Second Pan-American Scientific Conference on January 6, 1916. This certainly was an unfortunate choice, for in this he had said: "The Monroe Doctrine was proclaimed by the United States on her own authority. It has been maintained and always will be maintained, upon her own responsibility." This must have seemed like a dash of cold water in the face, yet other parts were more conciliatory, for example, where he said that the states of America should unite "in guaranteeing to each other political independence and territorial integrity" and should settle all differences by arbitration. This was repeated and amplified in his address to the Mexican editors on June 10, 1918. Perhaps El Salvador read the latter, for she soon announced that she would accept the League's invitation. Curiously enough, however, in a few months she proposed a Latin American League with the United States left out.

While the Chile-Peru boundary dispute was in progress, another boundary controversy was brought before the League. Panama had inherited from Colombia a dispute with Costa Rica. Two awards had been made, one by President Loubet of France in 1900, the other by Chief Justice White in 1914, but Panama refused to accept either, and in the winter of 1921 the two states had come to an armed contest. One of the last acts of the Wilson administration was to send down a warship with a warning to keep the peace while a settlement was being found. On March 4, the day President Harding was inaugurated, Sir Eric Drummond, Secretary General of the League of Nations, sought to take a hand in the quarrel, but Secretary

Hughes took charge and ordered Panama to accept the White award. With very bad grace she yielded to a superior power.

A good deal of criticism was leveled at the League for stepping aside so readily when the United States intervened, but Cecil B. Harnsworth, under secretary of state for Great Britain, told the Commons that there was nothing in the Covenant to bar the action of a third power not a member of the League. It is interesting to note that the party which rejected the League largely because it provided for the use of force in some contingencies, was quite ready to use a show of force to stop this trouble and compel one of the disputants to accept an award which it did not like.

The Panama-Costa Rica trouble was hardly out of the way—settled by Secretary Hughes, not by mediation or arbitration, but by a mere order to obey—when the Tacna-Arica dispute again appeared on the diplomatic horizon. This time (December, 1921) it was brought up by Peru, who proposed to Chile that they discuss their troubles in Washington. Chile accepted, and President Harding was selected as arbitrator. On his death President Coolidge took his place, and on March 5, 1925, Coolidge signed the award for a plebiscite, which was very displeasing to Peru. Every one is familiar with the failure of General Pershing and his successor, General William Lassiter, to carry out the award. In 1928 Secretary Kellogg finally brought about the resumption of diplomatic relations between Chile and Peru, which had been suspended for seventeen years. Soon after his inauguration President Hoover was able to announce on May 17, 1929, that the two countries had come to an agreement. The League of Nations had taken no part in the proceedings.

Things were happening thick and fast now. The Kellogg-Briand Pact renouncing war as a part of national policy and promising to settle disputes by peaceful means was being negotiated. Before signing, France gave out some interpretations of the treaty saying that wars of defense were not renounced, including such obligations as bound her under the Covenant of the League of Nations, the treaties of Locarno,

and her treaties of alliance (now called "neutrality"). When Secretary Kellogg accepted this interpretation, super-patriots in America began to ask whether the Pact would not be incompatible with the Monroe Doctrine, and wanted to talk of reservations. To counteract such talk, on April 18, 1928, Secretary Kellogg told Americans that the Monroe Doctrine was a policy of defense and that a nation could not sign away the right of self-defense, of self-preservation. In accepting the French interpretation Great Britain added on May 19 a Monroe Doctrine of her own to the effect that there were "certain regions [Egypt] of the world, the welfare and integrity of which constitute a special and vital interest for her peace and safety" and that interference in these regions would not be suffered. Secretary Kellogg feared that a Senate reservation on the Monroe Doctrine would kill the treaty in Latin America. Since the French and British interpretations had not been attached as reservations, he succeeded in staving off a specific Senate reservation, although that body before ratifying, heard read, but did not adopt, a report from the Foreign Relations Committee safeguarding a potential war in defense of the Monroe Doctrine.

While Secretary Kellogg was busy with his peace pact, intervention in Nicaragua, and strained relations with Mexico, the Council invited Costa Rica to resume her relations with the League. Before accepting the invitation Costa Rica requested the Council for its interpretation of Article XXI. In reply the Council declared that only the Assembly could interpret the Covenant. It added, however, that the Monroe Doctrine was unilateral and that only the United States, which had proclaimed it, could interpret it. "As for the significance of engagements to which Article XXI refers," continued the Council, "it is clear that this article cannot have the effect of giving to them a sanction or validity which they did not have before. Article XXI limits itself to the consideration of such engagements as exist, without seeking to define them, since an attempt at definition might end in narrowing or extending their meaning."

While the Nicaraguan and Mexican problems were still boiling, and before the multilateral pact had been ratified by the Senate and before the Tacna-Arica dispute had been disposed of, Bolivia and Paraguay stirred up a dispute of their own east of the Andes, which proved about the severest test the League of Nations had confronted in connection with Article XXI. This dispute was over the territory known as the Gran Chaco, concerning which differences had existed for over one hundred years. War seemed to be inevitable on the very day when the Pan-American Conference on Conciliations and Arbitration was assembling in Washington, December 10, 1928. At the opening session the Conference adopted a resolution, reminding the disputants that organisms existed for the peaceful settlement of such controversies and expressing the hope that they would use this method, which was cabled by Secretary Kellogg to the disputants.

It so happened that the Council of the League of Nations was also in session. As it is the business of the League to prevent wars, especially between any of its members, the Council held two secret sessions to discuss the situation. Clearly the relation of the League to the Monroe Doctrine was before them, and they went over this carefully. Briand, Chamberlain, and Adatci all agreed on the necessity of avoiding even the appearance of acting in competition with any peace agencies in existence in North or South America. Some of the members thought no action should be taken just then. On the other hand, the Chilean and Venezuelan members insisted that something should be done, and the result was that Briand cabled a mild resolution reminding both that they were members of the League, and solemnly pledged to seek a solution of their dispute by peaceful means.

Although the Monroe Doctrine was never mentioned, it seemed clear that it was in the minds of every member of the Council. Did Article XXI really exclude any action on their part in American affairs? That question had been asked and evaded in 1920. Eight years later the members of the Council, after sending that timid message, went to bed with uneasy

minds and were very much relieved next morning to learn that Washington had reacted favorably to what they had done. Another bridge had been crossed. Before separating, the Council sent another cable urging settlement under the terms of the Covenant, and Briand, who was hoping for a settlement outside the League, was to watch developments from day to day. When Chamberlain returned to London he was questioned in Parliament by Sir Nicholas Grattan-Doyle as to whether, in view of the Monroe Doctrine, the League had any jurisdiction in any part of America. Sir Austen replied that many clauses in the Covenant enjoined action offering friendly offices and that League action in any quarter was not a challenge to the Monroe Doctrine, Sir Nicholas then asked whether the United States could veto the action of the League in America. Chamberlain's reply that the question was unfair to the American policy of the Monroe Doctrine was greeted with applause.

In the United States there was a strong public opinion approving the action of the Council. On the other hand, a part of the press declared that the time had come to change the Pan-American Union from a theoretical to a pragmatic organization by taking monopolistic control of the Chaco dispute. The American problems should be settled outside the League of Nations. Nothing better could be found to strengthen the Union than the Chaco conflict. "The interventions of the League of Nations in this purely American problem is prejudicial," said the *Washington Post*. Evidently Secretary Kellogg did not share this view. The acute situation was only two days old when he, no doubt remembering his sad experience with the Tacna-Arica affair, announced that the United States had no purpose to take up the matter, since the Pan-American Conference had done so, and he offered not the slightest objection to the action of the Council, either then or afterwards.

The trouble lasted five years before any settlement was reached. The group representing the Washington Conference on Conciliation and Arbitration, commonly called the

"Neutrals," was almost continuously on the job. The Council dropped into the background after the "Neutrals" took it up, but had a standing committee of observation, never lost interest, was always ready to back up the "Neutrals," and sought coöperation from them. On August 4, 1932, nineteen Latin American states sent identical notes that they would not recognize any territorial gains made by force. This was regarded as a triumph for Secretary Stimson, who had announced this policy for Japan in Manchuria. The Council was particularly interested in this policy. If it failed in Latin America, it could hardly be expected to succeed in Asia against the Japanese "Monroe Doctrine." Señor Saavedra Lamas of the Argentine foreign office contended that non-recognition was not enough and declared that there was no legal basis for concerted intervention by the Latin Americans. He proposed an anti-war pact, somewhat like the Kellogg-Briand Pact, and got up the ABCP group (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and Peru) and offered its mediation. This offer, like all the others, was accepted, but it accomplished nothing. The "Neutrals" then renewed their efforts, and the Council, which had never received as much coöperation as it gave, decided to send a committee "to the spot." Señor de Madariaga, member of the Council for Spain, declared that the Council was "the only international authority which is under a legal obligation to find a solution for this conflict, and the Covenant of the League of Nations is the only legal link, the strongest and most definite link, between the two parties to the dispute." He named seven different occasions on which the Council's action had "been paralyzed, stopped and thrown out of gear by the fact that one or both parties has asked us to wait because the Commission of Neutrals was going to settle the question." He was not ungrateful to the Commission of Neutrals, or to Argentina, or to Chile, but he thought that there was a good deal of truth in the old English proverb, "Too many cooks spoil the broth."

The Committee was appointed, their lives were insured for \$54,000 each, and they were "on the spot" before the

Seventh Pan-American Conference met in Montevideo. The Council also asked the ABCP group to renew its efforts.

Why had all these efforts failed? There may have been something in Señor Madariaga's idea about too many cooks, but the facts seem to indicate that the broth was spoiled before the cooks appeared on the scene, at least that it needed stronger condiments than gentle reminders that the disputants were members of the League of Nations or that Latin American brothers should not fight, for Bolivia was set on securing an outlet to the sea, which she had failed to obtain in Tacna-Arica, and Paraguay was determined that she should not get it through any territory to which she had a claim. From the beginning both gave lip-service to their obligations under the Covenant of the League of Nations, but always laid down impossible conditions for arbitration. The year 1933 saw another and perhaps final test of Article XXI.

In September, 1932, some officers and soldiers of the Peruvian Army invaded Colombian territory, made prisoners of the officials of the village of Leticia, and were sustained by their government. This territory had been ceded to Colombia in 1922, but the Peruvian government claimed that the inhabitants were dissatisfied and wanted to be taken back under the Peruvian flag. After the quarrel had continued for some time, Colombia complained to Secretary Stimson that Peru had violated the Kellogg-Briand Pact. He at once laid the fact before the signatories to the pact, advised Peru to observe her obligations, and reminded her of the non-recognition declaration which she had signed along with eighteen other states applying to the Chaco dispute. Mr. Stimson at once notified the Council of what he had done. He was trying to apply in Latin America principles which he had already tried in Manchuria and might be called on to apply again. By applying the principles of the Pact and his own policy of non-recognition in an area covered by the Monroe Doctrine, he seemed to be trying to cut the ground from under the Japanese, who were claiming the same rights in Asia as they said that the United States maintained in the American continent.

On the next day after notifying Mr. Stimson, Colombia appealed to the Council. This was the first instance of an American state formally requesting the League to intervene to prevent war in an area covered by the Monroe Doctrine. The day before the League's Committee of Nineteen had broadcast for eight hours its report confirming and even sharpening the Lytton Report in condemnation of Japan's actions in Manchuria. As Mr. Stimson was coöperating with the Council in both disputes, he could hardly be expected to object to applying the same means and principles in both. The Council soon adopted the report of a committee recommending a plan of settlement, and the United States sent identical notes to both parties urging its acceptance. After some pressure Peru accepted. A League Committee was then appointed to work out details, and the United States and Brazil were invited to coöperate. Mr. Cordell Hull, the new secretary of state, accepted, but stipulated that our representative should only confer and advise, not vote.

Such was the situation when the Seventh Pan-American Conference met at Montevideo, December 4, 1933. On the first day a sixty-page memorandum of the League of Nations was handed out to the members, the purpose of which was to persuade the American nations to resign to the League unrestricted leadership as a world-peace organization and leave to it the settlement of the Chaco dispute. About one-third of the memorandum was devoted to the League's efforts in Manchuria, Chaco, and Leticia, and it declared that the Chaco settlement was being delayed by the efforts of other agencies, such as the Washington Commission of Neutrals.

Now Secretary Cordell Hull had gone to this conference, determined to settle the Chaco dispute, if humanly possible. He proved to be a good mixer and soon had won the confidence and friendship of a vast majority of the delegates. He told President Terra of Uruguay that the Conference would be discredited in the eyes of the world if it left Montevideo without terminating the Chaco war. Following his suggestion, President Terra appealed to the belligerents, but the

signing of an eleven-day truce (December 17) seems to have been due mainly to the presence of the Council's Commission, headed by Señor Alvarez del Vargo, a Spaniard, in La Paz when President Salamanca received the news that his major army of fifteen thousand had been captured. When the Commission arrived in Montevideo the Conference turned the whole matter over to it. The chairman thanked the Conference for its collaboration, but the feeling persisted that the Commission of Neutrals had impeded the settlement.

When the Conference adjourned everybody hoped that the end of the war was in sight, but this proved not to be true. At this writing (February 21, 1935) it is still going on, but the events related above had made it clear that Article XXI did not stand in the way of League participation in the settlement of American disputes. The outcome in the Leticia dispute was more fortunate. The United States appointed a representative on the League Commission to take over Leticia and transfer it to Colombia, and Peru graciously acquiesced. For some reason Colombia has not yet accepted, but it is confidently believed that she will.

The fact that Article XXI can no longer be held up as a bar to the settlement of American disputes by the League helps to clarify the situation, but this is not enough. When several nations or groups of nations offer mediation simultaneously, their plans are likely to differ, and this inevitably leads to confusion and delay. Far better results will be obtained with one mouthpiece for peace when backed up by the different nations.

The problem of intervention was bound to come up at Montevideo. Ever since President Theodore Roosevelt took over the customs duties in Santo Domingo, the United States has been subjected to criticism, amounting at times almost to a storm, for its policy of intervention, actual intervention in Nicaragua and Haiti, and near intervention in Cuba, Salvador, Costa Rica, and Mexico. At the Havana Conference (1928) an effort was made to get the Conference to commit itself in condemnation of intervention, but Mr. Hughes suc-

ceeded in sidetracking it. That year Mr. J. Reuben Clark, under secretary of state, at the request of Secretary Kellogg, compiled *A Memorandum on the Monroe Doctrine*, giving its background and the opinions of presidents and secretaries of state concerning it. From a study of this he reached the conclusion that the Monroe Doctrine was a policy of defense and that the United States could not under it claim the right to intervene in other states. He did say, however, that the right of intervention existed under "the necessities of security or self-preservation." A few days before going out of office Secretary Kellogg sent a note to our legations in Latin America, saying that the United States did not claim the right of intervention under the Monroe Doctrine, the note to be released on notice from the State Department. He called the attention of Secretary Stimson to it and understood that he would release it. More than a year later, in reply to an inquiry why the note had not be delivered, Secretary Stimson, says Mr. Kellogg, declared that President Hoover did not want it delivered. When in 1934 he was requested to give his reasons Mr. Hoover said that he had no recollection of the incident. It may be remarked that he had improved our Latin American relations some by his goodwill tour of South America and by a change in our Caribbean policy.

Such was the situation with regard to intervention when the Conference assembled at Montevideo. Here the Cuban delegate, Angel Alberto Giraudy, burst into a storm of criticism of the United States for her policy of intervention. "No marines were landed," he exclaimed, "but the United States engaged in intrigue against our President and his government through Ambassador Welles. If that is not intervention, what is it?" (It is interesting to note that Cubans were demanding withdrawal of recognition of the Machado government, not to say intervention, but when Machado was overthrown they demanded recognition at once.) In his attack Giraudy was ably supported by Señor Carlos Cuadra Pasos, the Nicaraguan delegate, who had fought against Mr. Hughes at Havana. He now proved to be the "hero of the debate" on intervention and

won his point, for the Conference adopted, Secretary Hull and Mr. Clark concurring, the report of the committee on international law defining recognition, denying the right of intervention either in internal or external affairs, defining the rights of foreigners, and forbidding recognition of territory acquired by force. Secretary Hull accepted these resolutions with reservations which were based on "commitments made in the past," and he promised to "end with all possible speed engagements" contrary to their spirit. Evidently he had in mind the treaty of 1915 and the Protocol of 1919 by which we had promised the bondholders to maintain financial control until the bonds were paid, apparently until 1952.

All this goes to show that our Latin American policy has been completely transformed since March 4, 1929. Mr. Hoover began a modification when he withdrew the marines from Nicaragua, but his lack of boldness was shown when he held up the Kellogg note and allowed the publication of the Memorandum in which Mr. Clark had said that a nation has the right to intervene "under the necessities of security and self-preservation." This could not be considered reassuring to the Latin American mind. Far more reassuring was Mr. Hull's declaration that no country need fear intervention during the Roosevelt administration. President Roosevelt had already announced his "good neighbor" policy, and Cuba was assured of willingness to discuss the Platt Amendment with her.

A few days after the Montevideo Conference adjourned President Roosevelt, speaking at a dinner commemorating the birth of Woodrow Wilson, went about as far as it is possible for a President acting alone to go in giving that assurance. He first quoted Wilson's Mobile Address to the effect that "the United States will never again seek one additional foot of territory by conquest," and declared that this policy had been accepted. He next gave assurance against intervention in these words. "The maintenance of constitutional government in other nations is not a sacred obligation devolving upon the United States alone. The maintenance of law and the orderly

processes of government in this hemisphere is the concern of each individual nation within its own borders first of all. It is only if and when the failure of orderly processes affects the other nations of the continent that it becomes their concern; and the point to stress is that in such event it becomes the joint concern of a whole continent in which we are all neighbors."

By this utterance President Roosevelt announced the continentalization of the Monroe Doctrine, a policy which had been rejected at Santiago in 1923, when proposed by Dr. Baltasar Brum. Following out this policy we shall have no more unilateral intervention under "the necessities of security and self-preservation," of which the intervening nation is the sole judge. Instead, intervention, if it ever comes, will be joint and only when and where "the whole body of civilized states [of the Americas] have concurred in authorizing it." Under such conditions intervention will be rare indeed.

All this sounded excellent, but Haiti and Cuba wanted that "good neighbor" policy put into effect at once. The most troublesome case was that of Haiti because of our pledge to the bondholders. After consultation with the National City Bank and the bondholders a way out was found. A new treaty abrogates the old arrangement. The government of Haiti is to buy the Bank of Haiti from the National City Bank, and the Bank of Haiti, which has been serving as treasurer and disbursing agent for the financial set-up, will now assume the service of the loan.

The promise to Cuba has been kept, for a new treaty abrogating the Platt Amendment was ratified by the Senate on May 31, 1934, with practically no opposition. It is to be hoped that Cuba will not test the sincerity of the Administration by repudiating the \$60,000,000 bond issue of Machado, which has been threatened. This would not be a "good neighbor" policy.

In November, 1934, a Bolivian, Gaston Nerval (Medina), published a book called *Autopsy of the Monroe Doctrine*. He sought to prove that it was already dead and should be buried. But the Senate was not convinced. It had refused to accept

the Covenant of the League of Nations even with Article XXI. Secretary Kellogg had persuaded it not to attach a specific reservation on the Monroe Doctrine to the Kellogg-Briand Pact, but it ratified with a mental reservation. It first ratified the Protocol of the World Court with five reservations which called for action by the nations already members. The members acted, and, after waiting several years, the Senate took up the question again. Before voting, it adopted without a roll call the Vandenburg Amendment (January 24, 1935) stating that ratification should not be construed as a departure from our "traditional policy" (Monroe Doctrine) in regard to European or American questions, and then rejected the Protocol.

Evidently the Senate did not think the Monroe Doctrine ready for burial. Yet the facts recited above indicate that it has been cleared of all carbuncles accumulated in the last thirty years and restored to its pristine form and vigor. Now it will probably not be necessary to adopt Senator Pittman's suggestion to scrap it, for the Latin Americans, having been made partners in it, will no longer fear it.

THE UTOPIAN NOVEL IN AMERICA,

1888-1900

ROBERT L. SHURTER

PERHAPS no other type of literature records the extent of popular discontent so accurately as does the utopian novel, which has generally flourished during depression periods. The recent depression has brought us descriptions of life in technocracies, pictures of ideal civilizations, glances at the shape of things to come, and novels written by the prophets of our present discontent, as well as revivals of many of the older idealistic works. Unrest which could find no outlet in action has sought relief in this literary quest for utopia.

For reasons closely linked with our history, the utopian novel has had a comparatively recent development in America. Men rarely turn to literature for an escape from unfavorable conditions so long as there is any possibility of actual escape; and until approximately 1890, the frontier offered a real means of deliverance from uncongenial surroundings, since it served as a safety-valve for our discontented members. By the last decade of the nineteenth century, the frontier era had ended; no longer was there an opportunity to put ideas into practical application; and it is highly significant that the same years that marked the end of our frontier era saw the publication of our earliest important utopian novels.

At the same time industrialism began to encroach severely upon personal liberty, bringing with the machine a concentration of wealth in the hands of a few, a growing urbanization, and a rising hostility between capital and labor. In addition, the works of men like Henry George, Francis A. Walker, and David A. Wells were presenting new economic ideas which instilled in the public a belief that many of our economic ills could be scientifically cured. Out of all of these factors, combined with a depression and readjustment period, there arose

a mass of utopian novels beginning in the late 1880's and continuing on past 1900.

In general, utopian literature has developed on two main levels in America. We have had the work of such men as George, Howells, and Bellamy, whose appeal has been definitely to an educated and literary class of readers; at the same time we have had another level typified by the productions of forgotten novelists like Ignatius Donnelly, Albert Chavannes, and Solomon Schindler, in whose works reform is secondary to fantastic adventure set in some future century. Yet these popular adventure books contained new theories described in human terms, and because of their large circulation, were sometimes as significant as the more intellectual works of Bellamy and Howells, from whom their ideas were derived.

The large group of utopian novels that appeared in the late nineteenth century was a product of American economic conditions. No similar body of literature existed in England at that time; in fact, the only important English utopian novels of the period were William Morris's socialistic *A Dream of John Ball* (1888) and *News from Nowhere* (1891), the latter written in answer to what Morris called "a horrible cockney dream," Bellamy's *Looking Backward*. The attempts that have been made to link the work of the American idealists with European reformers have been very inconclusive. It is true that Edward Bellamy spent a year in Germany, where he had presumably come into contact with Marxian socialism. Yet his widely imitated *Looking Backward* contains no hint of any Marxian doctrine of class war, and in 1889 Bellamy wrote as follows concerning the sources of the ideas expressed in his novel:

I never had, previous to the publication of the work, any affiliations with any class or sect of industrial or social reformers, nor, to make my confession complete, any particular sympathy with undertakings of the sort.

This statement is particularly important because practically all of the other American utopists derived their ideas from Bellamy.

Of all the forms of literature, the novel has been the most popular with the American writer who wished to present idealistic remedies, for the novel supplies the sugar-coating of a story to ideas which might otherwise fail to win a hearing. Another factor leading to the choice of the novel as the medium for broadcasting panaceas, was the amazing popularity of Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward*, by far the most influential utopian book yet published in America. Issued in 1888, its sales mounted to millions of copies here and abroad, and it has ever since retained its hold on the popular imagination—so much so that two new editions have appeared in 1933. Bellamy was hailed by many as the prophet of a new order, the Nationalist party was formed to effect the ideas of *Looking Backward*, and Bellamy Clubs enlisting thousands of members have existed from that day until this. Naturally the ideas and form of Bellamy's work were imitated, and as a result, over fifty utopian novels appeared between 1888 and 1900, a large number of them based directly upon *Looking Backward*.

Bellamy used to good effect the stock device of having his hero sleep for over a hundred years to wake up in 2000 A.D. in a new social era. The chief feature of this ideal civilization was the nationalization of all industry under government ownership. As Bellamy described it,

The nation was organized as the one great business corporation in which all other corporations were absorbed; it became the one capitalist in place of all other capitalists, the sole employer, the final monopoly in which all previous and lesser monopolies were swallowed up, a monopoly in the profits of which all citizens shared. The Epoch of Trusts had ended in The Great Trust.

This change was brought about without bloodshed or revolution of any kind, although the book, like most utopian works, remains indefinite as to the method used. In Bellamy's ideal social order, all labor was organized as an Industrial Army in which all citizens between the ages of twenty-one and forty-five must serve; each person worked only a few hours a day by virtue of the efficiency of machines, and all received an

equal share in the national wealth; there was no money, but only credit cards entitling the citizen to his share in the profits of the commonwealth.

Looking Backward stands up well under close scrutiny to-day; much of the book was written in the spirit of prophecy, and Bellamy was surprisingly successful in anticipating many of the ideas of our modern socialists and technologists. Yet to be impartial, one ought to state that no reputable economist has ever agreed with Bellamy's solution of our economic problems. The chief charm of *Looking Backward* for many readers lies in the apparent reality with which Bellamy describes his ideal commonwealth, for he possessed great literary ability, a keen imagination, and the art, as William Dean Howells declared in *The Atlantic Monthly* of August, 1898, "which Bellamy had in degree so singular that one might call it supremely his. He does not so much transmute our every-day reality to the substance of romance as make the airy stuff of dreams one in quality with veritable experience."

A study of the panaceas suggested by the utopists who followed Bellamy reveals many fantastic and amusing remedies, and a few that are extremely rational; they are all significant in indicating what the citizen of the late nineteenth century believed to be the crying evils of his own day. The tendencies chiefly deprecated in these works were the growing hostility of capital and labor, increasing urbanization, the trend toward monopolies, and above all, the possession of a large part of the nation's wealth by a small portion of its population.

Bellamy regarded unequal distribution of wealth as the greatest menace to American civilization, and to terminate this tendency, he constructed an ideal commonwealth in which wages were equal and all citizens shared alike. In decrying this trend, *Looking Backward* was the prototype of numerous other novels, chief among which were Ignatius Donnelly's *Cæsar's Column* (1890), Alvarado Fuller's *A.D. 2000* (1890), Albert Chavannes's *The Future Commonwealth* (1892), William Dean Howells's *A Traveller from Altruria*

(1894), Solomon Schindler's *Young West* (1894), C. N. Holford's *Aristopia* (1895), B. O. Flower's *Equality and Brotherhood* (1897), Alexander Craig's *Ionia* (1898), A. A. Merrill's *The Story of the Twenty-Second Century* (1899), and Bradford Peck's *The World a Department Store* (1900).

To solve this problem of unequal distribution, various plans are offered by the novelists. Some would set a limit beyond which no man can own property; others would restrict inheritances or the amount of land that one man can own. Interest is denounced by all as a device responsible for putting wealth and power into the hands of a few. The utopists abolish it, either by doing away with money entirely or by specifically forbidding savings to be put out at interest. In general, the authors are sympathetic with the laboring classes, although many of the writers were themselves from the upper strata of society.

The specific suggestions for social reform are too many and too varied to enumerate; included among them are such heterogeneous remedies as birth control, eugenics, calendar reform, abolition of the gold standard, a four-hour working day, a universal language, and innumerable schemes for governmental participation in business. One writer, Henry Olerich, in *A Countryless and Cityless World* (1893), would divide the population evenly throughout the country, thus eliminating the cities, which many believed to be the curse of mankind. Just how this was to be done equitably is left unexplained. Another, Bradford Peck, conceives of the whole world organized coöperatively as a department store, and his novel, *The World a Department Store* (1900), ends with a fervid invitation to the reader to buy the book and "be one of us, and let your posterity know that you were among the first to establish the Treasury Department of the Coöperative Association in America." Actually, a large number of these novels preach socialism or communism, but their authors are careful to eschew such names; all describe their ideal civilizations as "coöperative" or "nationalistic."

Nowhere does one get a better conception of how rapidly science has advanced in the last thirty years than in perusing these utopian books, for even the most vivid imagination of the novelists fails to approach reality. Bellamy, for instance, vaguely suggests a telephonic system resembling radio but not nearly so marvellous. Especially amusing are the estimates that these nineteenth-century men of letters made of the speed at which their descendants would travel. Characteristic is the prediction by A. A. Merrill in *The Great Awakening* (1899) that in the twenty-second century there would be "horseless carriages" which "would go twelve miles an hour, and sometimes fifteen." Yet, however vaguely these writers conceived it, science played a large part in their plans for the future as a servant which would relieve man's drudgery and allow him to have greater leisure and added luxuries.

By far the best novel of the entire group, from the standpoint of the literary critic, is William Dean Howells's *A Traveller from Altruria* (1894). Howells had the good judgment to refrain from the cheap tricks and pseudo-scientific predictions of his contemporaries; the chief value of his work lies in its satire on American life, written from the viewpoint of a detached and intelligent observer. Howells was among the first to recognize the significance of industrialism and the end of the frontier era. In contrasting the period of the 1850's with the 1890's, he writes:

If a man got out of work, he turned his hand to something else; if a man failed in business, he started in again from some other direction; as a last resort, in both cases, he went West, pre-empted a quarter section of public land, and grew up with the country. Now the country is grown up; the public land is gone; business is full on all sides, and the hand that turned itself to something else has lost its cunning. The struggle for life has changed from a free fight to an encounter of disciplined forces, and the free fighters that are left get ground to pieces between organized labor and organized capital.

Howells's solution of our economic problems is based on the ideas of Henry George and Edward Bellamy—in fact, there

is little difference between Howells's Altruria and Bellamy's commonwealth, as the following excerpt indicates:

Every one [in Altruria] does his share of labor and receives his share of food, clothing, and shelter, which is neither more nor less than another's. If you can imagine the justice and impartiality of a well-ordered family, you can conceive of the social and economic life of Altruria. We are, properly speaking, a family, rather than a nation like yours.

Like Bellamy, Howells is rather vague as to just how this change was brought about, although he tells us that "it was the intolerable suffering in the cities that chiefly hastened . . . the rise of the Commonwealth."

One is inclined to smile rather indulgently at most of the ideas expressed in these utopian novels, and to regard their authors as peddlers of freakish panaceas. Yet in the late nineteenth century this section of our literature was of the utmost importance, for these novels were read by millions, many of whom regarded them as the hope of civilization. Howells later looked back on this period and wrote in the "Preface" (1909) of *Their Wedding Journey*:

We had passed through a period of strong emotioning in the direction of the humaner economics, if I may phrase it so; the rich seemed not so much to despise the poor, the poor did not so hopelessly repine. The solution of the riddle of the painful earth through the dreams of Henry George, through the dreams of Edward Bellamy, through the dreams of all the generous visionaries of the past, seemed not impossibly far off.

For a decade the utopian novel was perhaps the most widely read type of literature in America; today, of this entire group of novels, only the works of Bellamy and Howells have survived. The others undoubtedly merit the oblivion to which literary historians have consigned them, for they are poorly written, with tawdry plots composed of large elements of sensational adventure. The utopian novel is significant only when studied in close conjunction with American economic history; to the economist or sociologist, it offers an excellent source for the study of popular opinion concerning social and

economic problems in the late nineteenth century. To the literary historian, the utopian novel represents a bypath, far removed from the main current of American literature, since it lacks sufficient literary value to be considered apart from its social and economic phases. Developing out of certain economic conditions, the works of the utopists forged into sudden popularity, to be as quickly forgotten as conditions changed. Only in the novels of Bellamy and Howells have we the fortunate combination of the man of letters possessing a keen social conscience, and these two deserve a permanent place in the literary history of America.

THE GOOD SAMARITAN OF ST. HELENA ISLAND

MASON CRUM

THE Good Samaritan in this story is the Penn School for sea-island negroes, nestled in the heart of picturesque St. Helena Island in the Carolina coast country.

Leaving the quaint village of Beaufort, South Carolina, situated on the bay, one crosses a modern bridge about a mile long, spanning Beaufort River as it widens out into the harbor, and lands on Ladies' Island. This bridge made the islands accessible to the mainland and has afforded numerous opportunities to the inhabitants, mostly negroes, for enlarged social and business intercourse.

These islands, St. Helena and Ladies', are part of the "Black Border" made famous by Ambrose Gonzales in his book of that title, in which he delightfully depicts the colorful dialect and philosophy of the sea-island negro.

This is a quiet country. One is impressed with the silence pervading every scene. The tides flow in and out without sound or motion, and with the exception of those periodic squalls which frequent the eastern seaboard in early fall, when the sea lashes the coastal villages, all is quiet and a pall of silence settles over the landscape.

At low tide the ooze of the marshland sends up an odor which is altogether pleasing. Oyster banks bristle with shells which wait patiently for the sea to return bringing its bounty of food.

After sunset the bay is red with the last rays of the retreating sun. River boats and barges, tied up for the night, throw their shadows flickering in the dark waters about the docks. The black line of the swamp across the river is silhouetted against the rosy sky. The tall marsh grass is still, and there is no sound but the raucous call of the water fowl resting in its shadow for the night.

Such is the scene about Beaufort and St. Helena Island on a quiet winter evening.

THE PICTURESQUE ISLANDS

Ladies' Island is separated from St. Helena by a narrow inlet. Crossing the former, one finds himself immediately on St. Helena, typical habitat of the sea-island negro.

To a hill-country man, such scenes may not appeal, but to one brought up in the "low country," there is an indescribable charm about nature's handiwork in this region. There is, to be sure, a certain raggedness about the countryside, but it has *atmosphere*. There are no trim pasture lands typical of the up-country, but there are live oaks festooned with Spanish moss—avenues of them—and where they overlap the highway, form graceful arches, cathedral-like. The swamps are dotted with fan-like palmettos, and the fields have, here and there, the tall palmetto tree, standing solitarily, rattling its stiff fronds with every breeze from the sea.

The deep swamp is the home of the cypress. There they stand solemnly in black water, with "cypress knees" poking up from their roots above the water surface getting air. In summer time this is the home of the dreaded cotton-mouth moccasin. On bright days cooters and terrapins bask in the sunshine, perched on logs and stumps, with necks distended and heads up, ever on the alert to slide off when trespassers come too near.

Across the island, one drives on sand and shell roads, high up above the tide line on secure causeways spanning the marshlands. The business center of the island is the United States Post Office at Frogmore.

Frogmore is but a settlement with one or two old-fashioned country stores. They carry in stock everything from hairpins to buckshot, and it is noteworthy that the store is run by a white man. Nearly all the inhabitants of the island are negroes. I was told by a colored Baptist preacher that there were about six thousand negroes on the island and only several hundred whites. Nearly all the inhabitants are mem-

bers of the Baptist Church. It is significant that practically this whole area about Beaufort was forsaken by the white settlers during the Civil War and they have been very slow in reclaiming it. Even until comparatively recent times many of the most important county offices were held by negroes. It is estimated that for years after the Civil War the ratio of negroes to white was at best ten to one.

Modern Beaufort is a lovely little village overlooking the bay. Its greatest charm is in the old homes that gracefully face the waterfront. It is a peaceful settlement—nobody in a hurry—and you go fishing within the town limits. In antebellum days the island was settled by planters. They had fine estates and scores of slaves.

FEDERAL TROOPS

Early in the war Federal troops took possession of the island, and the planters departed hastily, leaving what they could not carry to the mercy of their faithful slaves and the Union Army. But the Northern soldiers did not know what to do with the slaves. They soon discovered that they had suddenly thrust upon themselves a grave social problem. There were hundreds of slaves, many of them who hardly knew their right hand from their left, suddenly bereft of their masters. Somebody had to care for them. They had always lived under orders and had developed no initiative for the conflicts of life. Like children bereft of their parents, these slaves, with a new freedom they could neither understand nor direct, were helpless.

TEACHERS FROM THE NORTH

The call was made in the North for teachers to come south and care for the negroes of St. Helena Island. Among the missionaries who volunteered for the service were two young women from Pennsylvania, Miss Towne and Miss Murray; angels of mercy they were. Growing out of their labors was a school for the negroes of the island.

For forty years these two women lived and worked among

the black folk of St. Helena. No temporary adventurers were they, who, when tired of the monotonous life among a childish people on an isolated island, yearned to go back to their comfortable homes in the North. No, they came for life, and stuck through to the end. It was the writer's pleasure to talk to an elderly gentleman of Beaufort who had seen them and who knew them.

Thus the school was deeply rooted in the life of the island. The heroic work of these women goes on today. The school ministers to every need of the people of the island. For over seventy years it has stood like a beacon light in a waste of ignorance and social disadvantage.

At the present time the school is in charge of two cultured white women, Miss Rossa B. Cooley, principal, and Miss Grace B. House, vice-principal. The superintendent of the school is a fine negro, Mr. J. P. King. It was through his courtesy that the writer was shown the inner working of the institution. The superintendent is a man of fine bearing with a deep rich voice. Like all people who do things, he has little time for social superficialities, but instead goes straight to the point and reveals exactly what the school is doing. He is courteous, but business-like, never loafing mentally or physically.

The two ladies live in a simple but dignified cottage surrounded with ancient live oaks draped in Spanish moss. Inside the house there is air of culture and refinement—that culture which grows out of wide human contacts at home and abroad and that refinement which is the by-product of a life of unselfish service.

Visitors from all parts of the globe come to Penn School—missionaries, travelers, humanitarian curiosity-seekers. On the wall is a large map of Africa dotted with several big-headed pins, each indicating some person from Africa who visited the school. Had it been a map of the world, it would have been as generously dotted, for from all points of the compass they come.

RACE PREJUDICE

Quietly the school has gone about its work without heraldry and pomp. Hundreds of people in the state, of which the school is a part, have never heard of it. The name of Penn School rarely ever appears in the headlines of newspapers. It is not listed among the institutions furnishing college news for the daily press. Its work has been of an humble sort, as the world judges achievement. Throughout its history the few white people connected with its affairs have been looked upon with some suspicion socially by many of the locals. Racial antipathies are always without reason. You cannot account for them except through moral blindness and circumstance. The horrors of war, the sting of defeat, the tragedy of reconstruction days with its "carpet-baggers" and "scalawags," the prostration of a proud people—all these elements combined, furnish a rich seedbed for prejudice and its attendant evils. The unconscious prejudice of many Southern people, to say nothing of those in other sections against the negro, is a horrible thing; but when one is aware of the subtle forces which produce it, one is inclined to be less critical. You cannot excuse it, but you can explain it.

No man can live in the South without having his religion put to a severe test in this racial matter. I know of no greater opportunity that Southern people have than to demonstrate the genuineness of their religious profession. If ever the Christian Church had a rare opportunity to do a distinctly Christian thing, it is this chance to lend a hand to the negro.

My observation of Southern negroes leads me to believe that they do not want sympathy nor charity but that they desire justice. However, Christian principle goes further than this in that it extends mercy and kindness. Thus the Southern ecclesiastical organizations have an exceptional opportunity to prove to the world the genuineness of their creeds.

Penn School is doing for the sea-island negro that service which he needs most. The aims of the school have grown out

of the needs of the people. No theoretical curriculum ideas have been adopted, however nicely they fitted into the scheme of popular education. Instead, the course of study has grown up out of the demands for better living on the part of a people who are almost wholly agricultural.

Children of all ages are taken from primary grades on up through high-school level and above. Normal school training is provided in order that teachers and leaders may be produced to carry on and that the creative work of trained bodies may be felt from their own numbers.

HOME LIFE

The General Education Board has had an eye on Penn School, and in appreciation of its fine work has made possible the building of Butler House, which is being used for teacher-training purposes. Fifty were enrolled in the high school course.

If you are looking for the old-time sea-island negro in any great numbers, I would advise that you do not go to St. Helena. The school has done so much for them that their primitive ways have been largely supplanted by a higher culture.

This change is most noticeable in the home life of the negroes. "Better Homes" ranks among the chief aims of the institution. Visitors find it interesting to go through their model home on the campus. One discovers not a city house, but a country home, comfortable and with the creative touch of the artists. I saw attractive-looking over-stuffed chairs, finished in light blue cotton materials, made from halves of sugar barrels. Rush-bottom dining chairs were fabricated from native oak and corn shucks. Attractive bedcoverings artistically wrought with ebony fingers revealed the possibility of artistic appreciation of the black folks. A neat bathroom with simple but efficient plumbing and fixtures was observed; a model kitchen, well-appointed bedrooms, and attractive living rooms bore mute evidence of the kind of instruction given the eighty-seven girls who took such courses. They

learned better methods of cooking, canning, laundering, house-cleaning, gardening, and sewing.

School lunches are served the children for two, three, and five cents. I asked the superintendent what two cents would purchase. He replied, "A generous piece of rich cornbread." Now my guess is that it was old-time Southern crackling bread made of corn meal and "cracklings," the latter a by-product of lard-making. And a great dish it is—proteins and starch—a rich and wholesome filler for an empty stomach.

HEALTH

Health is another objective of the school's instruction. The reduced infant mortality rate of the island is the best evidence of progressive measures in this direction. For the entire United States (1929), the infant mortality rate per thousand live births among negroes was 106. On St. Helena Island it was only forty-eight (1921).

This achievement in health is due to the effective work of the pre-natal clinic (in coöperation with the Beaufort County Health authorities) instruction given the class of midwives numbering forty, the Annual Baby Day Contest and the nursing care given by the school nurses.

There were sixty babies competing in the Baby Day Contest—forty-seven of them received blue ribbons, having been adjudged perfect specimens.

PLAY

It is said that only a few years ago the people of the island did not know the meaning of play. The children had to be taught to play. Any observer of human nature, especially of children, has seen the human spirit released through play. What a drab world this would be without play! Now there are athletic contests, direction in games, wholesome competition, and the inhabitants of the island are beginning to reap some of the benefits of play.

These black children were instructed in the arts of the drama until they were able to produce a Christmas Mystery

Play, which won highest commendation from a visiting missionary, who had seen the Oberammergau production and made flattering comparisons with respect to the unspoiled genuineness and sincerity of the Mystery Play.

FARM AND SHOPS

The old campus is situated on a farm of three hundred and forty-three acres, seventy-six of which are under cultivation and two hundred sixty-seven in woodland. It is beautiful in its natural simplicity. Ancient live oaks, covered with Spanish moss, almost stifle one under their shade. Sand everywhere, roads of sand-clay and oyster shell.

Better methods of agriculture have been taught to whole families by visits of the teachers to their homes. Visits were made to two hundred and twenty homes from which children came (1931 report). Through the blacksmithing, wheelwrighting, cobbling, harness and carpenter shops, over fifteen hundred people were actually served last year.

The writer observed several boys making a substantial cart for use on the island. Who of the low-country has not seen these carts—light, economical, efficient, good for sandbeds, where the highways have not yet penetrated and economical, as one mule can furnish sufficient "horse power" for its operation? These boys make shoes, harness, farm implements, and scores of other things needed on a Southern farm. So their work is suited to their needs. There is no theory of education other than the needs of the people. One wonders if there is any other theory worthwhile.

EXTENSION WORK

Lastly, Penn School does effective extension work—it serves the community. Visit the Frissell Memorial Community House, the center of these activities. Fourteen clubs use this building, among them, the Community Singing Club, holding sings once a month, the Co-operative Society, the Credit Union, and others. Anyone who has not heard the negroes of the Carolina coast country sing their spirituals

has missed a real treat. They are the original creations of an interesting sector of American life. Here you will find the spirituals in all their purity, untouched and unspoiled by white musicians. The "spiritual" that is usually heard in our urban centers is no "spiritual" at all. It is usually so colored and adulterated by the ignorant conceptions of the "artist" that it becomes a cheap imitation of the original, and ought to be ruled out of programs unless explanations are given that it is merely an attempt. The spirituals of the Black Border of the Carolina coast country are a unique expression of the deepest religious emotions of the sea-island negro, given with a purity and sincerity which ought to be treasured by all lovers of true art.

NAPOLEON II

GEORGE MATTHEW DUTCHER

THE centenary of the death of the Duke of Reichstadt witnessed a revival of interest in the pathetic career of that unfortunate prince. The consequent exhaustive researches in public and private archives brought forth such a store of new documents that it seems unlikely that much additional light will ever be shed on his career. Though works began to be published about him before his early death and many have appeared since, even persons who are thoroughly familiar with his father, Napoleon I, and with his cousin, Napoleon III, know little if anything about Napoleon II. In fact, the young man never had an opportunity to participate in historical events, yet he was a personage of historical consequence with whom the diplomacy and politics of Europe were genuinely concerned throughout his life. Even his birth was encompassed with momentous significance.

Ever since his accession to supreme power in France, Bonaparte had been concerned with the absence of an heir from his marriage with Josephine de Beauharnais and had evolved various plans for dealing with this question of high import to himself, his family, and the state, indeed to Europe. After the treaty of Schönbrunn, October 14, 1809, with Austria, the problem became the Emperor's most immediate concern. In spite of his genuine attachment for Josephine, he resolved to divorce her, which he did on December 16, 1809, and to seek the hand of a princess of one of the ancient imperial families of Europe. Balked in his efforts to secure a sister of the Tsar Alexander, he turned suddenly to the Austrian Hapsburgs and in February, 1810, signed a contract for marriage with the Archduchess Marie Louise, daughter of the Emperor Francis I. The marriage was celebrated by proxy in Vienna on March 11 and in Paris on April 1. The Corsican upstart had allied himself with the proudest imperial

house in Europe, the family whose members had worn the venerable title of Holy Roman Emperor through several centuries.

The birth of the desired heir was not long delayed. On March 20, 1811, in the palace of the Tuileries, Marie Louise presented to the new Charlemagne a son who was christened Napoleon François Charles Joseph and proclaimed King of Rome. The joy and satisfaction of the Emperor were complete. Paris and the world applauded. The baptism of the child in the cathedral of Notre Dame on June 9 was a magnificent ceremony, after which he was taken to the palace of Saint-Cloud. There and at the Tuileries his first years were mainly spent. For the imperial heir a special household was created with the Comtesse de Montesquiou, a member of the old nobility, at the head.

The birth of his son marked the zenith of Napoleon's career. Thus far, with few exceptions, fortune had smiled upon him. At last the dearest wish of his heart had been fulfilled. The devotion and tenderness of the father for the child reveal the finer aspects of Napoleon's character. By contrast the mother rarely caressed her child whom she left entirely to the care of Madame de Montesquiou and her assistants. After the zenith the decline was not long delayed. Ten days after the birth of the King of Rome news reached the Emperor of Massena's reverses in Portugal—Wellington's triumphs in the Peninsula were begun. Only a little over a year later Napoleon set out from Paris for the campaign against Russia. Moscow, the retreat, Leipzig, and the first abdication followed rapidly.

It was on one of the closing days of January, 1814, that Napoleon spent the last hours ever permitted to him with his beloved son. Though the child was still two months short of three years of age he carried with him through life some memory of his father and never for a moment allowed himself to forget that he was his father's son. Two months later, on March 29, just after his third birthday, his mother, Marie Louise, fled from the Tuileries taking with her the child who

protested, "I do not wish to leave my home. I do not wish to go away. Since father is not here I am master." Never again did he see his "home," nor Paris. Mother and child lingered in the vicinity of Paris for a few troubled weeks while the fate of Napoleon, of France, and of themselves was being decided. On April 30, at her father's bidding, Marie Louise with her son crossed the Rhine on the way to Vienna. The child had ceased to be King of Rome and commented sadly, "I can see that I am no longer king for I have no pages." It was his last view of France, but the vision of France continued to fill his mind till his dying hour.

The victorious allies had decided that Napoleon should retire to Elba, that Marie Louise should be Duchess of Parma, and so for the nonce her son wore the title of Prince of Parma. Madame de Montesquiou and several other members of the Prince's household had accompanied him to Vienna, where they were installed in the palace of Schönbrunn. To them the child was left amid the strange new surroundings, while his mother hurried away to Aix to take the waters for her health. To watch over her welfare on this journey, the Emperor Francis assigned an accomplished army officer, Count Neipperg, who was destined before many months to displace Napoleon in the heart of Marie Louise. Though she never displayed much of the maternal instinct toward her son, it must be recognized that she was always extremely solicitous in the discharge of her moral responsibilities with regard to his upbringing and future welfare.

A second dramatic change in the Prince's situation was not long postponed. In March, 1815, news reached Vienna that Napoleon had returned from Elba to France. To the sovereigns and statesmen of Europe assembled at Vienna the alarm was genuine. Fears seized them that the Emperor would take speedy means to recover his wife and son. On the very day that Napoleon reached Paris, Madame de Montesquiou was abruptly dismissed from the charge which she had so admirably guarded for four years and bundled off to France. For greater security the Prince himself was moved

from Schönbrunn to the Hofburg in Vienna. Napoleon, indeed, exerted himself vigorously to regain his wife and son. In the latter case he was balked by the sinister Metternich. In the former case, for reasons already indicated, his efforts were hopeless. The heart of Marie Louise was dead to her imperial husband, and the mere thought of France made her shudder.

The terror was but momentary. Waterloo soon followed. Then came Napoleon's second abdication, this time made specifically in favor of his son, who was, five days after Waterloo, proclaimed Emperor Napoleon II. This arrangement could not but be intolerable to the Allied Powers, and the intriguing Fouché shortly blocked the scheme by restoring Louis XVIII and the Bourbons once more to power in France. All unwittingly the child of four had been for a few days the nominal Emperor of the French. The Hundred Days, however, were to be fraught with other results of more intimate concern to the boy. Not all the Allied Powers yielded to the insistence of Marie Louise, her father, and the Tsar Alexander in permitting her to retain the duchy of Parma, with right of succession to her son.

In the summer of 1815 the various French members of the Prince's household were relieved of their functions and sent back to France. Last of all, the nurse was dismissed in the following February. No person and no circumstance might remind the child of his French antecedents. He must no longer speak French but German; a new household, thoroughly Austrian, was created for him. Feminine influence was entirely removed. Henceforth the boy was surrounded with middle-aged men. The French children who had been the playmates of his infancy were gone. His childish friends henceforth must be his Hapsburg cousins, and they were not always congenial or desirable. The control of the Prince's education and destinies was entrusted in June, 1815, to Count Maurice Dietrichstein, an estimable nobleman of some military experience, of refined manners and cultivated tastes, and of unimpeachable character. The selection was thoroughly

satisfactory to Marie Louise, who maintained a diligent correspondence with the Count through the ensuing seventeen years. So far as the actual care and training of the Prince were concerned Dietrichstein and his colleagues had full charge, and their personal responsibility was almost complete, since Marie Louise returned from Parma and the company of Neipperg for only brief vacation sojourns in Austria. On those rare occasions the Prince was taken to the chosen resort to visit his mother for whom his attachment was genuine, though perhaps not deep—indeed why should it have been? In spite of the desires of both mother and son the Prince was never allowed to visit Italy.

Though Dietrichstein came to concern himself sincerely with questions involving the Prince's rights, his influence could count for little. To her credit Marie Louise did take genuine interest in these matters, but beyond appeals more or less passionate to her father, and even yet on one or two occasions to the Tsar Alexander, her efforts were of only partial avail. In the background was the sinister figure of Metternich, whose statecraft must conciliate the restored Bourbons of France in their relentless pursuit of the Bonapartes and of every Napoleonic survival. In 1817 the Bourbons insisted on the rights of the Spanish princess who had once been Queen of Etruria to the succession of Parma. Consequently, it became necessary, in order to safeguard Marie Louise's tenure, definitely to concede the succession on her demise to the former queen, thus positively excluding the Prince of Parma, who henceforth must forego the use of that title.

In view of her son's exclusion from the Parmesan succession, Marie Louise forthwith interested herself in securing definite and permanent rank and income for him. At last, on July 22, 1818 (note the fatal day), the Emperor Francis formally created the Prince Duke of Reichstadt in Bohemia, with the title of Serene Highness, and with rank immediately after the Hapsburg archdukes. The question of an independent income was left somewhat in abeyance, since some years would elapse before the boy would attain his majority, and it was,

indeed, never fully arranged. Thus the King of Rome had, in turn, ceased to be Prince of Parma and had become merely an Austrian duke. Furthermore, he must no longer use the hated name, Napoleon, but substitute the German Franz in honor of his Austrian grandfather.

In his four childish years under the tutelage of Madame de Montesquiou, the Prince had displayed remarkable precocity, and his education had been advanced to a degree astounding for his tender years, indeed to such a point as to strain unduly his budding faculties and strength. In consequence, Dietrichstein was confronted with more than the inevitable difficulties when he took over the responsibility for the Prince's training. Besides effecting the necessary adjustments to the child's health and overwrought mind, it was regarded as necessary to substitute German for his native French and, most difficult of all, to distract him from his curiosity about his father's career and fate. The Prince's memories of his father had not only been kept alive but stimulated by his French attendants with books of pictures illustrating the glories of the Napoleonic wars and régime. A few rebuffs taught the precocious child to keep his own counsels. Though he was bright and learned readily, he constantly irritated his tutors by apparent, if not real, neglect of his studies, and by mischievous, if not stubborn, refusal to reveal his knowledge of the lessons assigned. In time the infinite patience and tact to Dietrichstein and the tutors prevailed. In spite of his loneliness, his lassitude, and his mischievous disposition, the Prince had a high sense of honor and lofty ambition. He soon developed for himself the idea that he must make himself worthy to take up his father's career in the world.

When the news of his father's death was tactfully communicated to him in the summer of 1821, the grief of the ten-year-old child was pitiful. Speedily, however, he mastered himself, took new courage, and devoted himself to his studies with greater diligence. Though French and Italian had not been entirely neglected in his training, henceforth they were

given suitable attention along with German. Likewise the restrictions upon his education in history, in which he was peculiarly interested, were gradually removed, and he was suitably instructed concerning his father's career as well as in the other portions of modern history. The high spirit and quick wit of the lad frequently enlivened the imperial circle, as one day when a lady of the court deliberately piqued him by her remark about France. He quietly observed, "It must be a beautiful country." "But," she replied provokingly, "it was more beautiful a dozen years ago [that is, under Napoleon]." "So were you," countered the boy. Military training was, of course, a necessary part of the education of a young Hapsburg. To military science and history the Duke of Reichstadt took eagerly as became the son of Napoleon. Thus the years passed in fairly normal routine until the Duke was eighteen. He had come to understand that these were years normally set aside for a prince's education and that he was expected to concern himself little with the actual world about him.

The world, however, had not entirely failed to concern itself with the heir of Napoleon. The misguided rule of the Bourbons in France afforded abundant cause for discontent, criticism, and scheming, particularly contrasting the inept policies of the Bourbons with the glories of the imperial régime. Even while Napoleon still lived at Saint Helena, contriving individuals in France turned their thoughts to the son in Vienna and calculated on the possibilities of substituting him for the obnoxious Bourbons. After the Emperor's death the Bourbon unpopularity grew apace and so did the Napoleonic legend, the beneficiary of which was the passive recipient of Hapsburg tutelage who somehow might be brought back to France to restore the nation's glory. Both the French and the Austrian police were kept on the alert in forestalling plots to this end.

Not unwisely did the Austrian court surround the Duke of Reichstadt with the utmost care. To Metternich, the Duke might at any moment prove to be an invaluable hostage, not

merely to hold the French Bourbons in check, but to secure some larger European advantage. Bourbon emissaries, however, might attempt to assassinate him, or Bonapartist enthusiasts might undertake to seize and carry him off in a plot to place him upon the French throne. The dangers were not fancied but real, as Dietrichstein pointed out to the French poet, Barthélemy, in January, 1829. In collaboration with another writer, Méry, Barthélemy had just published an extended and flamboyant poem entitled *Napoléon en Égypte*, of which he had sent copies to the various surviving Bonapartes. Hoping to bring it also to the attention of the Duke, Barthélemy journeyed to Vienna, where he had two interviews with Dietrichstein. The Count accepted a copy of the poem but declined to show it to the Duke and refused to permit the poet an interview with the young Napoleon. One evening at the theater, however, Barthélemy was fortunate enough to catch some glimpses of the Duke, and on his return to Paris published a second poem portraying the Duke as *Le Fils de l'Homme*. The phrase has lived in the Napoleonic legend, to which the poem gave new vigor in France. This poem did come to the eyes of the Duke, whose mind was already occupied with problems of deep concern to himself.

A document of far greater import, his father's will, had just come to the Duke's attention. It is easy to surmise the effect upon his mind of the sentence which began with the words, "I advise my son never to forget that he is by birth a French prince." More than this he was puzzled that certain personal articles which the Emperor had provided should be transmitted to his son when he was sixteen had never reached him. He might well ponder the reason. Then came the disillusionment about his mother. Shortly after the death of Neipperg in February, 1829, the Duke learned the truth about the relations of Marie Louise with the Count. What could the child think of the woman who had abandoned the great Napoleon, his father? It was customary, moreover, when a Hapsburg archduke reached the age of eighteen that he should be given an army appointment and enter upon a period of

active service. The Duke's eighteenth birthday had passed without such recognition, though he had been awaiting it with impatient anticipation. Here was further food for his lonely reflections.

Dietrichstein and the other tutors could not be unaware of the problems that were perplexing their ward, and with the best sympathy and wisdom they could muster they tried to aid him in directing his studies on larger lines and to advance his interests in the matter of the military appointment. They recognized that the time had come when their duties were almost fulfilled, and when, under the guidance of suitable officers in active military service, the Duke should begin his independent career. Struggling with these perplexing problems, the boy rapidly emerged into manhood and became keenly interested in discovering what place he should make for himself in the world.

It was at this point that the Duke, whose youth had passed without friendships, found two persons whose sympathy and confidence were to be the strongest influences in the brief span of life that remained to him. The Archduke Francis Charles, the second son of the Emperor, had recently married the Bavarian princess Sophia (their two sons became the venerable Emperor Francis Joseph and Maximilian, the ill-fated emperor of Mexico). She was six years older than the Duke and endowed with a pleasing personality and high character. The Duke soon awakened her sympathy and interest. She welcomed his company, won his confidence, and became for him both a refuge and an inspiration. In June, 1830, the Duke was at Grätz for a visit with his mother, who was on one of her vacation pilgrimages to Austria. One evening he found beside himself at dinner a major, some thirty-five years of age, Prokesch, Ritter von Osten, who had just returned from a mission in the Balkans and the Levant. The Duke was delighted to meet him because of the pleasure he had experienced in reading Prokesch's account of the Waterloo campaign. The two immediately became fast friends. Prokesch was full of interest over his observations of the Greek strug-

gle for independence and, learning that none of the princes thus far suggested for the Greek throne had proved acceptable, ventured the suggestion of the Duke of Reichstadt. The idea found some acceptance in the imperial entourage and flattered the Duke, but obviously, with Metternich, nothing came of it.

Weightier events were impending. At the end of July, revolution once more broke out in Paris. Charles X was driven from his throne. The question now was, who should become the new ruler of France? Naturally the Bonapartists were active on behalf of Napoleon II. The suggestion was not without popularity. The Duke's pictures were on sale everywhere in Paris, and appeared in many windows. Events on the banks of the Seine, however, moved too fast, and Metternich as ever was hostile. The choice of Louis Philippe was by no means gratifying to Metternich, but at any rate he had the Duke at his disposal as a threat to badger the July Monarch into more or less satisfactory behavior. As for the Duke himself, he had followed the Paris events in the journals with high excitement, but was constrained to recognize that his hour was not yet come. The following month brought still another revolution, this time in Belgium. To the suggestion of some rash spirits that the Duke of Reichstadt would be a suitable candidate for the new throne, Metternich replied with startling brevity, "Once and for all excluded from every throne." Later still, insurrection broke out in Poland. Again Napoleon II was proposed for the kingship. This time the suggestion came to his own ears, and for some time the Duke played fondly with this new illusion.

The year 1830 was not to end without a dramatic personal experience for the Duke. One November evening he was about to enter the house of his tutor, Baron Obenaus, in Vienna when a young woman suddenly seized his hand and kissed it. He was still more surprised when she declared, "I am your cousin Napoleone Camerata." She was the daughter of Napoleon's sister Elisa—a masculine and somewhat adventurous creature, a law unto herself. She was regarded so

queer and harmless that she had been permitted to visit Vienna and to effect this encounter. Despite repeated efforts she failed to communicate with the Duke again. It was, however, her fixed purpose to arouse the Duke to seize the French crown. She did not know that thoughts of France were firing the Duke's very soul; she could not understand that he was helpless, he could not stir. A few weeks prior to this affair Reichstadt had made an acquaintance of real significance, the famous Friedrich von Gentz. It is strange that it was not till so late a date that this confidential adviser and agent of Metternich had met the Duke, to whom he was at once attracted and to whom he became a useful friend and counsellor. With Gentz's strange friend, the celebrated dancer, Fanny Elssler, contrary to some accounts, the Duke had no contacts.

The Camerata affair was followed by more serious efforts of the surviving Bonapartes and their adherents to approach the Austrian court on behalf of Napoleon II. In turn, Joseph, Lucien, Jerome, Count Montholon, Baron Collins, and lastly, in May, 1832, Louis Napoleon undertook the vain task. Early in 1831 revolts broke out in Modena and Bologna. Some, at least, of those involved in these outbreaks avowed their purpose to establish the rule of Napoleon II. Metternich believed the movements were the result of French intrigue. The relations between France and Austria, already tense, were further strained to such a degree that Metternich actually threatened France with the possibility that Austria might itself place Napoleon II on an Italian throne. In February the Italian situation took a new turn. Heretofore the revolutionists had respected the position of Marie Louise in Parma; now trouble broke out there, probably from local reasons, and the Duchess was compelled to take flight. Austria immediately intervened to restore her, but, to the intense disappointment of both mother and son, Metternich refused to permit the Duke of Reichstadt to take part in the military operations. Any other action would, however, have been highly impolitic both for Austria and for the Duke.

Meanwhile other interests were crowded upon Reichstadt's attention. In January, 1831, he made his *début* in the political society of the Austrian capital by appearing at a reception given by the English ambassador, Lord Cowley. The occasion, however, had another importance, for during the evening occurred a famous meeting between him and Marshal Marmont, who had recently arrived in Vienna as a political exile. The incongruity of this meeting between the son of Napoleon and the Marshal who had betrayed him in 1814 was obvious to the curious beholders. To Reichstadt, however, the situation made a different appeal. He greeted Marmont: "Marshal, I am delighted to meet one of the earliest comrades in arms of my father." Through an arrangement approved by Metternich, if not actually planned by him, there ensued a series of conferences between Marmont and Reichstadt in which the Marshal instructed the young man with recollections of his father and discussions of his military campaigns. At the same time Marshal Maison was in Vienna as the ambassador of Louis Philippe. The Duke met him occasionally and likewise greeted him as an officer who had served under his father. The early weeks of 1831 also witnessed Reichstadt's first experiences in the social whirl of Vienna and his earliest flirtations, notably with the Countess Nandine Karolyi.

Over against the brighter experiences continued the exasperation about his military appointment and his military household. To the dissatisfaction of the Duke, of his mother, of Dietrichstein, and of Prokesch, Metternich insisted on selecting as the Duke's military mentor an officer of little standing or competence, General Hartmann, and also insisted that the Duke should take up his military residence not at Vienna or possibly Prague, but at such an inconsequential post as Brunn. Under all the circumstances neither Metternich nor the Prince and his friends were anxious to complete the arrangements. Besides, in the midst of so much political turmoil it was obvious to all concerned that it would be wiser for the son of Napoleon to remain at Vienna. As early as 1828 Reichstadt had been given a nominal military appoint-

ment and later, nominal promotions. It was not until June 14, 1831—the Duke observed that it was the anniversary of Marengo and Friedland—that his formal introduction to military life took place. For the moment at least his assignment was with troops in the environs of Vienna. The new duties of his military life were diligently discharged by the Duke and absorbed much of his attention in the ensuing months.

The political pot was no longer boiling furiously but rather simmering. The son of Napoleon was coming to realize that, after all, events were not precipitating themselves before he might acquire the years, discretion, and experience which should fit him to profit by them and to take the place in the world for which he was born. While the Duke was relieved from the stringent, though well-intentioned, supervision of Dietrichstein, he felt the loss of the more congenial companionship and guidance of Prokesch, whom Metternich had shipped off on political missions in Italy. There remained one friend to whom he might turn, the Archduchess Sophia, and to her he resorted constantly, and not in vain, for diversion, for sympathy, and for counsel.

Ever since the year 1830 the health of Reichstadt, which for some time had not been robust, had been a matter of solicitude to his physician and others close to him. It was, however, impossible to prevail upon him to follow a regimen designed to safeguard his health and build up his strength. The physician unfortunately wrongly diagnosed the case, at first, as liver trouble, and the Duke's own knowledge of the disease (ulcerated stomach) which had proven mortal to both his father and his grandfather confirmed his incautious neglect of the effects of repeated colds upon his throat and lungs. A severe attack in August, 1831, was followed by a few weeks of improvement thanks to enforced restraints during a period of cholera epidemic. Later in the autumn, however, the trouble returned and by January had become serious following his final effort to appear with his regiment at a military funeral on the sixteenth. With the return of spring came some alleviation of the tubercular symptoms, but

in June the aggravation of the disease developed rapidly. Marie Louise was summoned from Italy, and arrived on the twenty-fourth. Conditions grew steadily worse. On July 21 the Duke moaned to his physician: "There is nothing for me but death." About dawn on the following morning he passed away. Two days later his remains were deposited in the family vault of the Hapsburgs in the church of the Capucins in Vienna.

The son of the Corsican, who had risen to be the new Charlemagne and had died as the prisoner of Saint Helena, had met his untimely end in an alien capital and had been laid to rest beside the monarchs of Europe's most venerable dynasty.

By birth Napoleon II was half a Bonaparte, half a Hapsburg, and such he was in personality. Marmont declared:

I find in him the look of his father and it is therein that he chiefly resembles him. His eyes are not so large as those of Napoleon but deeper set in their orbits and have the same expression, the same fire, the same energy. His forehead also recalls that of his father. There is also a resemblance in the lower part of the face and the chin. Furthermore his complexion is that of Napoleon in his youth. The same paleness and the same color of the skin. But all the rest of his face recalls his mother and the house of Austria. His height exceeds that of Napoleon by about five inches.

From his father he inherited his principal interests: military affairs and history (he left a library of 1,136 volumes, mainly on these topics); his adventurous spirit, ambition, strong will, and skill in managing people; his desire for approval and love of popular acclaim. These traits were balanced by certain characteristics inherited from the Hapsburgs, especially from his mother. Most significant of these were lack of a spirit of application, a habit of indecision, fondness for personal adornment, and enjoyment of art, music, and the opera. He loved horses and had a passion for fast driving, hard riding, and hunting. There is no valid evidence for impeaching the truth of Prokesch's explicit refutations of the gossip about the Duke's immoral relations with women. Though he never found himself comfortable with his Haps-

burg relatives, he respected his grandfather, the Emperor Francis, and appreciated his kind-hearted solicitude. On the other hand, his handsome appearance, his charming manners, and his lively conversation made the youth a general favorite with the imperial family and entourage. From the very day of his arrival in Vienna he was popular with the crowd which never failed to watch his public appearance with curiosity and friendly enthusiasm. Personally the Emperor Francis was always anxious to promote the welfare and happiness of his grandson, but he was ever finding that reasons of state circumscribed his action.

These reasons of state were embodied in the State Chancellor Metternich, whose hatred for the father revealed itself in cold resentment of the very existence of the son. There is no evidence that Metternich ever did anything directly inimical to the Duke or his personal welfare. His prime concern was to keep the youth in harmless obscurity and thus avoid his becoming a cause of international complications. Though the State Chancellor regarded the Duke as perhaps ninety per cent a liability, there were clearly occasions in his manipulation of European politics when he regarded him as at least ten per cent an asset. To Metternich must doubtless be assessed the credit or the blame that the training of Napoleon II was such as to fit him to be an inconsequential Austrian nobleman rather than a potent figure in the affairs of Europe worthy of his father. Rostand, in his celebrated and gloriously romantic play, *L'Aiglon*, has drawn an extremely clever portrait of Metternich that is as unjustifiably malignant as the gorgeous setting and highly strained action in the apotheosis of the son of Napoleon are unwarranted by authenticated historical facts.

It is useless to speculate on what might have been, but if the Duke had survived until 1848 the chances of that revolutionary year might have placed him rather than his cousin, Louis Napoleon, in the government of France. Napoleon II would have been a different Emperor of the French from Napoleon III. It would be rash to hazard that he would

have been wiser, better, or more fortunate. That he was more honest and more honorable than his cousin is scarcely open to question. Napoleon II's most notable deficiency was lack of experience. There was nothing in the situation to indicate that added years would have brought him material gain in this important respect.

The tragedy of the son was as real as the tragedy of the father, but it was in a minor key and in paler colors. The very antithesis completes the tragedy.

MALTHUSIANISM AND THE DEBATE ON SLAVERY

J. J. SPENGLER

IN NO part of the world was as much propagandistic use made of the population doctrines of T. R. Malthus (first enunciated in 1798) as in the ante-bellum South. While a few Southern writers sharply criticized Malthus' views, many were not content (as were pro-Malthusian writers in other sections of the world) to employ these views against utopian collectivism, against agrarianism, against state support of schools, and against governmental provision of relief for the distressed and the poverty-stricken. Malthus' Southern disciples directed his doctrines against those who favored either the gradual colonization of the negro population or the forcible termination of the institution of slavery. Some found in Malthus' principles a sufficient explanation of the origin of slavery while others built upon Malthusian principles the argument that only a slave economy was immune to the many social ills allegedly inherent in a free capitalistic economy.

While Malthus' views do not permit terse summarization, he apparently held to the following principles. First, population growth is dependent upon the growth of the supply of capital and food and can take place only if the supply of capital and food is augmented. Second, man has a greater inherent capacity to multiply his numbers than to multiply the supply of food and capital. Third, poverty and low wages are caused primarily by the pressure of population upon the means of subsistence. Fourth, man can improve his lot in proportion as he defers marriage until he is able to support a family. Fifth, man will defer marriage and avoid the burdens of too large a family only in proportion as he is inspired with prudence and thriftiness and the desire to better his condition and is made primarily responsible for his actions and their consequences. Sixth, public charity is in general to be con-

demned because it relieves man of the costs and pains of imprudence in regard to early marriage and procreation, because it thus encourages imprudence, and because it destroys the very capital whereupon human welfare and progress depend. Seventh, collectivist and communist utopias cannot in the long run benefit the common man, for they relieve him of responsibility for the support of himself and his family and thus inevitably give rise to the destruction of capital and to population pressure. Whether Malthus and his English disciples believed that the bulk of mankind would follow his advice and improve their lots it is somewhat difficult to say; they admitted the theoretical possibility, at times expressed doubt, and at times predicted that man's lot would improve. The Southern disciples of Malthus, however, as we shall see, selected from his principles those on the basis of which a gloomy case could be made for the future of man, particularly if he lived in a free society.

I

The doctrine that population tends to press upon the means of subsistence and to depress wages was introduced into the debate on slavery in the Constitutional Convention in 1787, eleven years before Malthus wrote. It was to be repeated on the eve of the Civil War. At the Constitutional Convention George Mason, Virginia slaveholder, recommended the abrogation of slavery, saying that slavery placed physical labor in disrepute, retarded the development of industry and the arts, and checked white immigration into the South. In reply Oliver Ellsworth of Connecticut, later a chief justice of the United States Supreme Court, supported the South Carolina view that the question of slavery be left to the individual states:

As slaves also multiply so fast in Virginia and Maryland that it is cheaper to raise than import them, whilst in the sickly rice swamps foreign supplies are necessary, if we go no further than is urged, we shall be unjust toward South Carolina and Georgia. Let us not intermeddle. *As population increases, poor laborers will be so plenty as to render slaves useless.* Slavery in time will not be a speck in our country . . . as to the danger of insurrection from foreign influence, that will become a motive to kind treatment of slaves.

In 1827 Henry Clay predicted that population pressure would reduce the value of slaves, but said nothing of the ultimate elimination of slavery.

As our population increases, the value of slave labor will diminish, in consequence of the superior advantages in the employment of free labor. And when the value of slave labor shall be materially lessened, either by the multiplication of the supply of slaves beyond the demand, or by the competition between free and slave labor, the annual increase of slaves will be reduced, in consequence of the abatement of the motives to provide for and rear the offspring.

George Tucker of Virginia was the first to predict when slavery would disappear. In 1837 he stated that "the great law of human destiny, so ably developed by Malthus," coupled with the greater cost and lesser efficiency of slaves as compared with free labor, would spell the doom of slavery. When the slave states have been "supplied with as many as can work their lands to advantage it will be impossible to prevent" the emancipation of slaves. Slavery, he said, could not exist in the "most advanced stages of society" where extreme industry is necessary to secure support because the system of slavery, by reducing the efficiency of the slave and by fostering idleness and dissipation in the master class, lessened "the productive industry of a country." In 1843 he observed that when, because of the pressure of numbers on resources,

the earnings of a slave will not repay the cost of rearing him . . . his master will consider him as a burdensome charge rather than a source of profit; and as the same decline in the value of labor once liberated the villeins or slaves of Western Europe, and will liberate the serfs of Russia, so must it put an end to slavery in the United States should it be terminated in no other way.

This may be called the euthanasia of the institution, as it will be abolished with the consent of the master no less than the wishes of the slave; and the termination will be sooner reached because the labour of slaves, by reason of the inferiority in industry, economy and skill, inseparable from their condition, is less productive than that of freemen.

Sixteen years later he said that "long before" the "density [of population] has reached its maximum, the price of labor will have so fallen that the value of a slave will not repay the cost of rearing him, in which case, slavery, no longer profit-

able to the master, will naturally expire." To the contention that the rising price of slaves contradicted his prediction, Tucker replied that the price of slaves would fall as the increasing supply of cotton and similar products depressed their exchange value and thus reduced the profits of agriculture. "The doom of its [slavery's] death, though we know not the time or the mode, is certain and irrevocable," he wrote in 1843.

The specific data of slavery's expiration depended upon the extent of the territory into which the slave system was introduced, upon the adaptability of slave labor to manufacturing, and upon the kind of crops grown. In 1843 Tucker predicted that, in view of the probable increase of population, slavery would expire between 1903 and 1923. In 1859 he extended the period ten years to allow for the acquisition of Texas. "In less than a hundred years [after 1843] slavery will, in all, or nearly all, of the states, die a natural and easy death." In view of the probable disappearance of slavery and in view of the belief that the allegedly inferior freed negro would constitute a problem, Tucker in 1843 recommended the colonization of some of the slaves and the private manumission of others inasmuch as "the emancipated class are found to increase more slowly than either the slaves or the whites." Samuel Seaberry, D.D., of New York, upholder of slavery and believer in the Union, recommended in 1861 that domestic slavery "*be governed by the laws of population and labor*" which would, as Tucker predicted, ultimately eliminate slavery.

The Slave States are more populous now than they were then; the population of some of them having nearly reached that point of density, where the maintenance of the slave is of more value than his labor, and where, consequently, slavery dies a natural death; the owner himself being glad to be relieved of his burden. In proportion as this point is approached, the value of slave labor depreciates; and the density of population is increased in proportion as its expansion is prevented.

II

A special phase of Malthusianism was employed by Thomas R. Dew, an ardent classical economist, in his attack upon proposals to colonize the negro population. Dew argued

in substance that such colonization schemes would destroy the very capital whereon the growth and support of the white population depended. Dew's attack was precipitated by the memorable debates on slavery in the Virginia House of Delegates in the 1831-32 session which followed four months after the Nat Turner insurrection. Slavery, it was urged by T. J. Randolph, J. A. Chandler, and others, checked the increase of the white population and encouraged that of the black. Soon there would be one, two, or three million blacks in Virginia, "an amount too great, too appalling for a statesman not to apprehend some danger from." Whites refused to immigrate into the negro-ridden parts of the state. Surplus whites, lacking jobs, emigrated. "For," as one writer stated, "as some intelligence or property is required to enable a man to belong to either of the first two classes above enumerated [professional men, capitalists, proprietors, and artisans], and [as] no one with ordinary self-respect can submit to sink below them, and become outcasts, the immediate tendency of the supernumary members is to emigration." Accordingly, it was proposed that the slaves of Virginia be gradually manumitted and transported to Africa, the expense to be borne by the state. Such a policy, it was argued, would foster the relative increase of the white population. Had not Henry Clay so remarked in 1827?

By the annual withdrawal of fifty-thousand persons of color, there would be annual space created for an equal number of the white race. The period, therefore, of the duplication of the whites, by the laws which govern population, would be accelerated.

Although the proposal failed to carry, Professor Dew presented his learned defense of slavery and attack on negro colonization, a veritable arsenal for future pro-slavery writers. The colonization plan, he contended, would have an effect opposite to that intended. The growth of the slave population would be furthered, that of the white checked. Were the state to buy up negroes and deport them, the price of slaves would rise; slave owners would breed them so rapidly that

their number could not be reduced; the resulting "habits . . . generated among our blacks" would tend to produce an overpopulation of blacks. Among the whites, on the contrary, the "spring of population" would be deadened. The taxes raised to purchase the slaves would reduce the capital and the productivity of the state. Hence, among the whites, of whom all had high standards of living (including necessities, conveniences, and luxuries), matrimony would be discouraged, children would "be less abundantly supplied," and the already slow rate of increase would be halted or reversed. Accordingly, even if the slaves could be removed, there would be no whites to replace them. In reply to those who remarked on the slow rate of increase of the white population in Virginia and on the tendency of whites to emigrate from Virginia, Dew stated that the slow rate of increase in Virginia reflected the commendable prudence of the white population and that emigration could not reduce the rate of population growth unless capital also emigrated and paralyzed "the spring of population."

Following Dew's statement, the colonization plan was not subjected to attack upon purely Malthusian principles. A Baptist minister, possibly of Penfield, Georgia, wrote in 1844 that the presence of slavery "prevents the immigration of large bodies of ignorant and lawless foreigners into our territory."¹ Stephen Colwell, a Northern writer, in a pamphlet, *The South* (1856), observed that the emancipation of the English serfs had produced the Elizabethan poor laws, "a code which long subsequently gave birth to Malthus' theory of population, an idea far more unChristian than had ever

¹ After the Civil War, R. G. Barnwell, editor of *DeBow's Review* (XXXVII, March, 1869), stressed the need of white immigration into the South as did subsequent writers.

"The legislators of the South should take up this subject and understand its bearing and importance. In Georgia, Mississippi and Virginia the whole public interest seems involved in the reconstruction act—in the problem how to relieve individual disfranchisement and suppress negro influence. This is alone to be effected by such practical and material measures as the importation of ready made white people. We commend immigration into, or through the South as the most immediate and effective mode of restoring the influence and prosperity of the South."

found favor among the holders of slaves in a Christian land." Edmund Ruffin, in *Slavery and Free Labor* (1859), and in *DeBow's Review* (June, 1859) declared that if Virginia ridded herself of slaves, the agricultural interests would be injured, because a long time would elapse before an adequate and equally cheap supply of free labor had become available. As the pro-slavery argument became integrated during the decade or so following the Virginia debates, serious consideration ceased to be given to colonization proposals.²

III

Returning now to the line of argument presented by Tucker, we find that a number of writers held similar views relative to the tendency of population to grow and press upon the means of subsistence. These writers did not, however, reach a similar conclusion relative to the future of slavery. Thus in 1826 Edward B. Brown explained both the origin of slavery and its disappearance from Europe in Malthusian terms. Declaring that "population has a tendency to increase in a greater ratio than the means of subsistence" and that "a state of SLOTH . . . seems evidently to be the natural state of man," Brown reasoned that when population had become too dense to permit a pastoral economy to supply adequate food, the institution of slavery had been established to compel naturally lazy man to engage in agriculture and provide himself with food. Thus slavery was explained in terms of population pressure. Its origin could not be attributed "to the cupidity of gain and love of domineering." Nevertheless, he wrote of Europe as follows:

²D. R. Goodloe, a critic of the slave system, contended that the slave system required the investment of several times more capital than did the free labor system and thus absorbed capital which could otherwise have been utilized to develop the South. He suggested that freeing the slaves would create a mass demand for products. He predicted that the inability of the Southwest to absorb the growing slave population would greatly depress the value of slave property. He attributed the slow growth of the white population in the slave area to the slave economy. See *Inquiry into the Causes Which Have Retarded the Accumulation of Wealth and Increase of Population in the Southern States: In Which the Question of Slavery Is Considered in a Politico-Economical Point of View* (Washington, D. C., 1846).

The same equalization of the wages of labour with the means of subsistence which led to the destruction of slavery in the Northern states, may be distinctly traced to have been the chief cause of emancipation of slaves in Great Britain.

Presumably to clinch his defense of slavery and to avoid the conclusion that population pressure would eliminate it, Brown argued that slavery involves inequality, the prerequisite of civilization. For if land is relatively cheap and the competition of masters for relatively scarce laborers drives the price of labor to a sum "fully commensurate with the value of the product," the laborer will be able to gratify "the love of independence—thus tending to produce perfect equality, which is destructive to subordination and morality; both of which are necessary to civilization."

J. H. Hammond, ardent pro-slavery governor of South Carolina, admitted that population pressure would render free labor cheaper than slave labor, but failed to draw Tucker's conclusion.

In all countries where the denseness of the population has reduced it to a matter of perfect certainty that labor can be obtained whenever wanted, and the labor be forced, by sheer necessity, to hire for the smallest pittance that will keep soul and body together, and rags upon his back, while in actual employment—dependent, at all other times, on alms or poor rates—in all such circumstances it is found cheaper to pay his pittance than to clothe, feed, nurse, support through childhood and pension in old age, a race of slaves.

Edmund Ruffin, the great agronomist, expressed a similar opinion:

Whenever want and competition shall reduce the wages of free labor below the cost of slave labor, then it will be more profitable for the slave owner and employer to hire free labor (both cheapened and driven by hunger and misery) than to maintain slaves, and compel their labor less effectually and at greater expense. Under such conditions slaves (if they could not be sold and removed to some other country where needed) would be readily emancipated by masters to whom they had become burdensome.

George Fitzhugh, Virginia lawyer, who sought to forge a sociology and political economy for the South, in *Sociology for the South* and *Cannibals All* argued that population pres-

sure had caused free labor to be substituted for serfdom in Europe. "The multitude of laborers, and their competition as freemen to get employment, had rendered free labor cheaper than slave labor." He attributed the exploitation of British labor to the institution of free labor rather than to an "excess of population," however, for "England has not attained that density of population which enables [compels?] men to live by the least amount of labor." Edward B. Bryan of South Carolina in *The Rightful Remedy* (Charleston, 1850) merely observed that "slavery can only be abolished by being undersold. . . . The moment free labor becomes cheapest in any country, slavery is there already at an end." Bryan may have been aware of the fact that immigrant free labor was employed in the South to build canals, etc., in sickly regions, because slave owners were unwilling to risk the lives of expensive slaves.³ In 1846 Mathew Estes, of Columbus, Mississippi, anticipated a day "when the Anglo-American shall have peopled the continent of North America, and shall from the density of population, find it difficult to procure the means of subsistence." But Estes, like Bryan, said nothing of the future of slavery.

What is of interest to the student of the history of ideas is the methods employed by Southern writers to avoid Tucker's conclusion. For if one admits that free labor is less well paid than slave labor, or that as population pressure develops free labor will be less well paid than slave labor, how can one avoid the conclusion that the free labor system must displace the slave system? It is in the argumentative devices employed by these slavery-defending disciples of Malthus that one finds a cue to the popularity of Malthus' doctrines in the South. These doctrines proved adaptable to the formulation of an aristocratic philosophy, of a philosophic defense of slavery, of a satisfying verbalisation of the merits of the slave system as compared to the free labor system. This verbalisation, in turn, and the counter-verbalisation of the Northern critics of

³ The Roman writer, Varro, in 37 B.C., had "advised the use of free laborers in malarious districts (*gravia loca*) because slaves were too valuable" to be exposed to such risks. See J. L. and Barbara Hammond, *The Rise of Modern Industry* (New York, 1926), p. 15.

slavery constitute a chief immediate reason for the inability of the opponents to effect a compromise and avoid conflict. For man is seldom governed by reality, by the *Ding an sich*. The stage of his motivation is set rather by verbal misinterpretations of reality, by verbal formulae and magic incantations for which there is little substantial basis. Such formulae were developed in the North and in the South, Malthus' doctrines forming an important ingredient of the latter.⁴

Several tacks were followed by the pro-slavery Malthusians. Some, such as Bryan, Estes, and Brown, simply ignored the problem involved. Others said that slave labor was as cheap or cheaper than free labor when proper social cost accounting was employed, or when adequate weight was given to the allegedly greater efficiency of slave labor. Yet others asserted that slave labor was cheaper and would remain cheaper. The racial theorists argued that negro labor could be rendered productive only under a slave system. Yet others were content to argue that because of population pressure the lot of the free laborer was worse and would remain worse than that of the slave. Finally, certain writers contended either that population pressure and the other alleged ills of free capitalism could be kept out of a well-controlled slave economy, or that a slave economy was inherently immune

⁴ Both W. Gilmore Simms and George Tucker comment on the formulation of these verbalisations between 1830 and 1850. Simms wrote in 1852: "Twenty years ago, few persons in the South undertook to justify Negro Slavery, except on the score of necessity. Now, very few persons in the same region, question their perfect right to the labor of their slaves . . . and more, . . . their moral obligation to keep them still subject, as slaves, and to compel their labor, so long as they remain the inferior beings which we find them now, and which they seem to have been from the beginning. This is a great good, the fruit wholly of the hostile pressure. It has forced us to examine into the sources of the truth; to reject the specious formula, which originally deluded us, and still deludes so many; and to feel the strength of our argument, by which we are justified to our own consciences, and to know our justification, as slaveholders, to be complete, according to all proper morals, and in accordance equally with sacred and profane experience."

Tucker in 1843 declared that the "zeal" of the meddling Northern abolitionists had killed much of the anti-slavery sentiment in the South and had enlisted philosophy, religion, love of liberty, statesmanship, and scholarship in defense of slavery. "The difference between gentle and violent means in influencing men's wills [was] never more forcibly illustrated. Nor is the effect a temporary one. All the prejudices of education and habit in favour of slavery, have struck their roots the deeper for the rudeness with which they have been assailed."

against the contents of Malthus' Box of Overpopulation, however much the evils contained therein might afflict free capitalistic economies. Thus in the hands of this last group of writers slavery, salted with Malthusianism, became a positive good, and Malthusianism became another pro-slavery arrow to be added to a quiver containing the ever present biblical, moral, legal, anthropological, historical, economic, and political arrows.

Ruffin, more than others, stressed the allegedly greater efficiency of the slave system and the fact that, so long as this system was preserved, a free labor system could not develop along side of it. Ruffin contended that although the lot of the free laborer was worse than that of his serf forbears or than that of the Southern slave, it was not true that "free labor is cheaper than slave labor." For the slave was more productive than the free laborer because the slave system was more efficient and the slaves worked more continuously. Hence, their owners could and did protect them from the want and destitution which one found in "free society" where the workers were slaves to capital, a form of slavery,

to which, at some future time, must be subjected the laboring poor of New England, and every other community . . . where there is a dense population. . . . Whether negro slavery is considered the greater or the less evil, it is certain that its existence either prevents, or is incompatible with, the presence in the same community, of class hireling slavery.

Governor Hammond distinguished but did not stress the difference between the individual and the social costs of labor. He contended, as did his fellow statesman, Chancellor William Harper, that free labor is cheaper than slave labor. "The tendency of population is to become crowded, increasing the difficulty of obtaining subsistence." Competition, as a result of population pressure, becomes increasingly intense. "Where competition is intense, men will labor for a bare subsistence, and less than a competent subsistence." Hence, "slave labor can never be so cheap as what is called free labor." Hammond suggested, however, that from the social point of view

free labor was not so much cheaper than slave labor. Free labor was cheaper than slave labor to the individual entrepreneur but not to the community as a whole, for under the system of free labor entrepreneurs shifted to the community certain costs which were borne by the slave owner under the slave system and which in the free system were properly chargeable to the entrepreneurs.

While such writers as F. L. Olmstead believed that the cost of slave labor (in Virginia) exceeded the cost of labor in the free states, and while it was sometimes true that the lot of certain slaves was better than that of certain European workers, Ware and other writers, whom I mention below, denied that slave labor was more expensive on the whole, even when the social costs of old age and dependence were included. In fact, Professor C. F. McCay of Columbia wrote that slavery provided "the cheapest labor . . . possible." Malthus' subsistence wage, "however approximated to elsewhere, has never been reached but in the South." Dew was of the opinion that slave labor cost less than free labor, although the lot of the former was preferable.

A number of writers, particularly Cooper, J. H. Van Evrie, J. Nott, and those interested in medicine and anthropology, contended that since the negro belonged to an inferior race, his labor capacity could be used only under a slave system. It could not be used under conditions of free labor. Others (including the Northern writers, Grimké and Weston) implied this argument when they suggested that the negro population could increase only in a slave economy and that in the struggle for racial survival under conditions of free labor the natural superiority of the white would lead to the elimination of the negro.⁵

In general, the pro-slavery writers were content to use

⁵In 1863 President J. M. Sturtevant of Illinois College (Cf. *Continental Monthly*, III, 1863) predicted that the freed black slaves would be unable to earn enough to support a family and hence "must melt away and disappear forever . . . like his brother, the Indian." A century earlier a Dr. Milligan of Charles-Town had opposed the extirpation of the Indians on the ground that their presence would prevent the growth of insurrectionary negro bodies.

Malthusianism to bolster the argument that the black slaves were better off than the masterless wage slaves of Northern and British capitalists and that consequently the slave system deserved to be supported on the ground of its humanitarian superiority over the free labor system. For under the free labor system population pressure developed and facilitated the exploitation of the wage earner whose lot as a result was more miserable than that of the slave. Probably not a Southern proponent of slavery but could contrast the slave favorably with the British wage earner. Had not Benjamin Franklin said that the latter was much worse off than the lowliest American Indian? Already in 1822 E. C. Holland declared the negro slave to be better off than the English helots, "the poorer classes of labor in England," and sought to demonstrate this by comparing the respective lots of the slave and the English wage earner. Holland cited R. J. Turnbull, a South Carolina planter, to the effect that, since the slave population increased more rapidly than British and European populations, it was apparent that "want and poverty" bore more heavily upon the free wage earners. With this view many writers concurred from Edward Brown in 1826 to W. A. Smith who, in 1856, declared the slave was better provided for throughout his life than Northern menials who, having futilely striven for something better, are tempted "to employ the political franchise to unsettle the foundations of society, by levelling down the whole to a common platform."

William B. Giles, writing to Lafayette in 1829, cited his (Giles's) letter to *The Richmond Enquirer* (January 6, 1827) in support of the superiority of slavery.

Alas!! poor miserable manacled, starving, naked, *perfectly free* English operative; he is first cruelly stripped of all rights, and then told to enjoy *all* he has *with perfect liberty*. He is a perfect *freeman*. He is *no slave*. How charming must be the blessings of liberty to a perfectly free, fashionable, English operative!! How much better his condition, *confined to his parish*, without bread or covering, than the Virginia slave surrounded with every comfort for animal indulgences.

John C. Calhoun declared in 1837 that the free laborer was more exploited than the slave who worked under the patri-

archal system of the South. "In few countries is so much left to the share of the laborer, and so little exacted from him, or where there is more attention paid to him in sickness or in the infirmities of old age." Pictures of the horrible lot of British workers, as revealed by Parliamentary reports, are sprinkled through the pro-slavery writings. William Grayson, the Charleston poet, even expressed in verse (*The Hireling and the Slave*) the opinion that the half-starved free hireling would eagerly exchange places with the slave, that the slave system prevented pauperism and the class struggle and provided the negro with "what European schemers in vain attempt to do for the hireling." In 1849 the anonymous author of "Slavery and Abolitionists" (*The Southern Quarterly Review*, XV, 1849) referred to "the thousands of publications of the day in relation to the *misery of the bulk of the people of European nations*. White slaves they have properly been called."

George Fitzhugh's two works mentioned above were designed to show "that labor makes values, and wit exploits them and accumulates them . . . that the unrestricted exploitation of so-called free society, is more oppressive to the laborer than domestic slavery." He pictured a competitive society in which population was outdistancing capital, unemployment was increasing, and the wage earner was less well provided for than the slave. Like Karl Marx, he noted that ownership of capital was becoming more and more concentrated and that increasingly large numbers were becoming dependent solely upon wages; but, unlike Marx, he anticipated no historical solution through the rise of the proletariat. Instead, he found in the slave economy the only workable solution:

Free society is theoretically impracticable, because its friends admit that in all old countries the supply of labor exceeds the demand. Hence a part of the laboring class must be out of employment and starving, and in their struggle to get employment, reducing those next above them to the minimum that will support human existence.

In old countries there is a superfluity of laborers, and they, in competing to get employment, under-bid each other, till wages reach the

lowest point, that will support human existence; but the master is afraid so to depress the wages of his slaves, else he might lose the slave.

As modern civilization advances, slavery becomes daily more necessary, because its tendency is to accumulate all capital in a few hands, cuts off the masses from the soil, lessens their wages and their chances of employment, and increases the necessity for a means of certain subsistence, which slavery alone can furnish, when a few own all the lands and other capital.

Fitzhugh proposed that the South build its own economy on a slave base. He advised the South to discard the abolitionist and free trade economics of "Smith, Say, Ricardo, & Co." who but glorified a Free Society in which "slaves without masters" worked for a wage that was virtually death. He preferred, instead, a government-controlled slave economy.⁶

An anonymous contemporary, writing on "Slavery and Freedom" (*The Southern Quarterly Review*, April, 1856), upheld Fitzhugh's views even to the extent of regretting that there was not a gallows on which political economy and its apostles might be gibbeted, ministering as they did to "groveling capitalists" and meddling with "questions which concern much higher interests of society." This writer contended that the free labor system was defended by economists because it was cheaper and because it pauperized the masses. Slavery, on the contrary, was sanctioned by nature, by the Bible, and by the fact that its abolition involved social disaster. Slavery was "desirable and inevitable" for the "larger portion of humanity." Slavery alone "preserves the proportion between population and subsistence," harmonizes capital and labor, protects the weak, improves "inferior" races in every sense, consolidates society, and maximizes the happiness of mankind. In short, this writer, like Fitzhugh, believed that since the advent of free labor would destroy the superior virtues of the slave economy, this economy needed to be preserved despite the alleged greater cheapness of free labor.⁷

⁶ In the manner of a true propagandist, Fitzhugh pointed to the alleged numerousness of Communists, Free Lovers, Atheists, Bloomers, Suffragists, Mormons, Free Soilers, Millerites, Agrarians, Grahamites, Shakers, Spiritual Rappers, Widow Wakemenites, and multifarious other "ites" and "ists" in the abolitionist "free society" North.

⁷ This view was attacked in *DeBow's Review* (XXI, 1856) by an anonymous

IV

The crowning Malthusian pro-slavery argument and the last to be effectively formulated was the contention, already referred to, that the institution of slavery constituted the only effective means of laying the Malthusian Spectre of Overpopulation. For under slavery the increase of the blacks was controlled by whites who were driven by pride to control their own numbers. Where free labor prevailed, the unbridled fertility of a prideless proteteriat insured over-population and mass poverty and possibly social strife.

At first it was merely suggested that since excess negro slaves could be used for manufacturing, their growth need not be a source of difficulty. Thus in 1827 Thomas P. Jones, Southerner of Northern birth, declared that in view of the limited possibilities of cotton culture "it is absolutely necessary that other employment should be found for the hands." He recommended the use of the slave in manufacturing industries, adding that slave labor was steadier and cost but one third as much as free white labor. Chancellor William Harper expressed a similar opinion:

When the demand for agricultural labor shall be fully supplied, then of course the labor of slaves will be directed to other employments and enterprises. Already it begins to be found, that in some instances it may be used as profitably in works of public improvement. As it becomes cheaper and cheaper, it will be applied to more various purposes and combined in larger masses. It may be commanded and combined with more facility than any other sort of labor; and the laborer, kept in stricter subordination, will be less dangerous to the security of society than in any other country, which is crowded and overstocked with a class of what are called free laborers.

writer who held that free labor and slave labor were both types of social organization, each superior under certain conditions. Political economy, which had ignored slavery as it existed in America, could, when "properly appealed to, bring the strongest possible arguments in favor of negro slavery." This writer contended that while free labor had not worked perfectly in England because of English institutions, free labor was the "natural" system for England. Slavery, on the contrary, was the "natural" system for the South, where the necessary labor could be performed only by negroes who, being of an inferior race, could function only as slaves and not as free men. In the South, under the slave economy, each class occupied a position "suited to its capacities" with the result that approximately "perfect justice" was attained.

Governor Hammond merely noted that "we are beginning to manufacture with slaves." Ware, while not of the opinion that slavery was the most desirable institution, observed that since the slaves were available, they should be used for manufacturing purposes because the price of their labor was but one-sixth that of free labor. A protectionist in the free trade South, Ware believed that manufactures produced by slave labor could free that section in part of dependence on England and could compete in foreign markets with foreign manufactures. J. D. B. DeBow shared this opinion:

The remedies then which, we propose, to prevent the evils of a too redundant slave population, are *the employment of slave labor in the construction of railroads throughout the southern states, and the use of negroes in our factories and in our work shops*. In this way we can build all the important roads in the southern states without taking anything of consequence from the available means of our people, and we can obtain those articles of taste and elegance which we now rely upon the north to furnish us, made at our own doors. We must bring slave labor. We must continue to seek out and find new fields for slave labor, whenever it ceases to be profitable in agriculture. These are the measures which we are bound by the highest obligations to adopt, to ward off the alarming evils of a rapidly and fearfully increasing slave population, confined as we think it will be within its present limits, unless there is a great change in the political condition of the country.

Not until 1858 (*The Southern Literary Messenger*, June, July, August) did a writer consider the problem that would exist when all the occupations that could be filled by slaves had been filled by them, a problem defined as important by Judge Warner of Georgia in 1856. Then, said R. E. C., it would be necessary for slave owners to regulate the natural increase of the slaves, a regulatory function beyond the power of the employers of wage slaves under the free labor system. Thus, under slavery, the increase of the working population would always be under control and the dangers of a multiplying proletariat would be avoided. The slaveholder's ability to keep only as many slaves as he needs is the "very self-protecting against over-population existing in slave countries, which is wanting in free society."

Slavery, it was said, would prove equally efficient in keep-

ing white increase within the bounds of the desirable. Already in 1832 Dew drew attention to what he called commendable Virginian prudence:

We believe, at this time, the preventive checks are in full operation in Virginia. The people of this state live much better than the same classes to the North, and they will not get married unless there is a prospect of maintaining their families in the same style they have been accustomed to live in. We believe the preventive checks may commence their operation too soon for the wealth of the state, but they always mark a high degree of civilization—so that the slow progress of population in Virginia turns out [to] be her highest eulogy.

In 1851 an anonymous writer (*The Southern Quarterly Review*, XIX, 189) defended Southern civilization and the slave system against the attacks of antislavery writers. Noting its many evils, he said "the free labour system is a failure" and predicted overpopulation and poverty for the Northern States: "When land becomes scarce, and their pent up population has no vent, then evil will be upon them in full force." This writer implied that such would not be the case in the South, but offered no supporting argument.

Fitzhugh, in *Sociology for the South*, sought to present empirical evidence, as did D. R. Hundley, that a slave economy provided a margin of safety against poverty and inculcated psychological attitudes designed to prevent overpopulation. Fitzhugh wrote:

Population increases slowly, wealth rapidly. In the tide water region of Eastern Virginia, as far as our experience extends, the crops have doubled in fifteen years, whilst the population has been almost stationary. In the same period the lands, owing to improvements of the soil and the many fine houses erected in the country, have nearly doubled in value. This ratio of improvement has been approximated or exceeded wherever in the South slaves are numerous. We have enough for the present and no Malthusian spectres frightening us for the future. . . . We have poor among us, but none who are over-worked and under-fed. We do not crowd cities because lands are abundant and their owners kind, merciful, and hospitable.

The loose economy, the wasteful mode of living at the South, is a blessing when rightly considered; it keeps want, scarcity and famine at a distance, because it leaves room for retrenchment. The nice, accurate economy of France, England and New England, keeps society always on the verge of famine, because it leaves no room to retrench, that is to

live on a part only of what they now consume. . . . One free citizen does not lord it over another; hence that feeling of independence and equality that distinguishes us; hence that pride of character, that self-respect, that gives us ascendancy when we come in contact with Northerners. It is a distinction to be a Southerner, as it was once to be a Roman Citizen.

It remained for the unidentified R. E. C., already referred to, to explain why in a slave economy undue increase of the master class would be as improbable as unwanted increase of the slave class. Agreeing with Malthus' refutation of Godwin's communism and with the thesis that poor laws simply aggravate pauperism and destroy self reliance and moral fibre, R. E. C. stated that "free labor leads to a superabundance of population, which brings in unbridled competition . . . and all the woes which flow from it." For in a free society pride is lacking, and tradesmen will no more defer marriage until they can afford it than will day laborers. Nor will, nor can, education inculcate such prudence. In the North and in free society in general "there exists no well defined line of demarcation between the lowest class of society and the class immediately above it, and downwards transition is easy and not attended with very much shame or injury to men's feelings." In the South, on the contrary, where physical labor is deemed degrading and fit only for slaves, prudence necessarily governs sexual relations. The Southerner, "unless already degraded, will not marry if he perceives that by doing so, he must sink himself or his offspring to that level which is in his country that of the slave or the colored man." Southerners "are compelled to acquire such knowledge as will fit them for something *above*" physical labor. It follows that "slavery is a mighty bulwark" against population pressure, "the chief, almost the only cause of social evils." For "it is owing to the influence of slavery that the whites increase more slowly in the South than in the free states."

This writer, therefore, believed that the South would attain the economically most desirable population, namely, one that "its agriculture, manufactures, and commerce can maintain in comfort and abundance. But this is the limit. Any in-

crease beyond this point is an evil." For, even though a larger population were desirable for military purposes, the writer declared that the South could defy any foe "on our own soil." Accordingly, this writer was opposed to opening "our country to foreign or Northern emigration, and let loose without check or hindrance the mighty engine of population, in order that we may hereafter puzzle our ingenuity in discovering for its redundancy the remedies which so many have sought for in vain." Thus by the eve of the Civil War Malthus' doctrines had been woven and integrated into a perfect theoretical defense of slavery.⁸

* Bibliography: Articles by the present writer in *Journal of Political Economy* (1933), *American Economic Review* (1935), *Marriage Hygiene* (1935). See also: Thomas Cooper, *Lectures on Political Economy* (Columbia, 1826 and 1829); *Manual of Political Economy* (Washington, 1834); J. N. Cardozo, *Notes on Political Economy* (Charleston, 1826); N. A. Ware, *Notes on Political Economy* (New York, 1844); H. Vethake, *Principles of Political Economy* (Philadelphia, 1838); T. R. Dew, *Lectures on the Restrictive System* (Richmond, 1829); George Tucker, *Essays on Various Subjects of Taste, Morals and National Policy* (Georgetown, 1822); *Laws and Wages, Profits, and Rent Investigated* (Philadelphia, 1837); *Progress of Population and Wealth in the United States* (New York, 1843); "Correspondence with A. H. Everett" (*Democratic Review*, XVII, 1845; XXII, 1848); *Political Economy for the People* (Philadelphia, 1859); George Fitzhugh, *Sociology for the South* (Richmond, 1854); *Cannibals All* (Richmond, 1857); and D. R. Hundley, *Social Relations in Our Southern States* (New York, 1860).

For the views of Dew, DeBow, Harper, Hammond, Simms, Nott, Christy, Stringfellow, Cartwright, et al., see *The Pro-Slavery Argument* (Charleston, 1852); DeBow, *The Industrial Resources, etc., of the Southern and Western States* (New Orleans, 1852); E. N. Elliott, *Cotton Is King* (Augusta, Georgia, 1860). The pamphlets and books referred to include: E. C. Holland, *A Refutation of the Calumnies Circulated against the Southern and Western States Respecting the Institution and Existence of Slavery among Them* (Charleston, 1822); Edward Brown, *Notes on the Origin and Necessity of Slavery* (Charleston, 1826); Thomas P. Jones, *On the Progress of Manufactures* (Philadelphia, 1827); William B. Giles, *Political Miscellanies* (Richmond, n. d.); John A. Chandler, *On the Policy of the State with Respect to Her Slave Population* (Richmond, 1832); Anonymous [Baptist minister], *Slavery: A Treatise Showing That Slavery Is Neither a Moral, Political, Nor Social Evil* (Pennfield, Ga., 1844); Matthew Estes, *A Defense of Negro Slavery as It Exists in the United States* (Montgomery, Ala., 1846); J. H. Van Eyrie, *Negroes and Negro "Slavery"* (New York, 1861); Samuel Seabury, *American Slavery Distinguished from the Slavery of English Theorists and Justified by the Law of Nature* (New York, 1861); W. A. Smith, *Philosophy and Practice of Slavery* (Nashville, 1856). For the views of Marshall and others, see Daniel R. Goodloe, *The Southern Platform; or Manual of Southern Sentiment on the Subject of Slavery* (Boston, 1858). For Dew's essay in abridged form, see *American Quarterly Review* (Sept., 1832). See also U. B. Phillips, *Life and Labor in the Old South* (Boston, 1929); *Studies in Southern History and Politics* (New York, 1914); F. L. Olmsted, *A Journey in the Seaboard Slave States* (New York, 1856); *Works of John C. Calhoun* (New York, 1856); *The Life and Speeches of Henry Clay* (Philadelphia, 1853); W. G. Brown, *The Life of Oliver Ellsworth* (New York, 1905); G. M. Weston, *The Progress of Slavery in the United States* (Washington, 1850); and F. Grimké *Nature and Tendency of Free Institutions* (Cincinnati, 1848).

PUBLIC BENEFITS OF PRIVATE PROFITS

WALTER J. MATHERLY

THE SYSTEM of private profits in America as well as elsewhere faces an uncertain future. The philosophy of economic self-interest originally stated by Adam Smith and so ably defended by him in his analysis of "the wealth of nations" is confronted today, as never before in its history, with a multitude of foes. Pundits innumerable are boldly declaring that private business has outlived its usefulness, that it is no longer adapted to present-day ways of living, that it must eventually disappear. Stuart Chase argues that "the economy of scarcity" based on vendibility must be replaced by "the economy of abundance" based on serviceability. H. A. Overstreet contends that "we move in new directions"—from the old motive of profit-making to a new motive "of fulfilling human life." Norman Thomas informs one and all that "the road before us" is the road, not of private capitalism but of socialism. Other authors as well as certain statesmen here and there advocate other alternatives to profit-making. But before we accept the conclusions of its critics and consign the system of private profits to the limbo of outmoded institutions entirely, we might find it not altogether an unworthy task to reexamine its functions and reappraise its benefits—its public benefits.

Private business is the mechanism designed by man to satisfy his wants. It is human energy utilized for the purpose of creating wealth through the purchase and sale of goods and services. Men engage in business to make money, but when they make money they generally make things other men desire. Business consists of both manufacturing and selling; it is concerned not only with factories, farms, and financing, but also with markets, merchandising, and meeting demands of customers. The business man connects the processes of production with the processes of distribution. He either

directs the techniques of fabricating finished products or the techniques of trade, or does both together; but he is always engaged in buying and selling in one form or another for the purpose of acquiring pecuniary gain.

Business is not only an individual form of activity; it is also a social form of activity. It seeks not only to make men wealthy—to provide private well-being, but also to make society wealthy—to produce public well-being. The very definition of wealth implies the old Anglo-Saxon notion of *weal* or welfare. The opposite of wealth is *illth*, to employ a word originally used by John Ruskin. The social purpose of business based on private profits is to decrease or eliminate *illth* and to increase or universalize wealth.

The interests of private business and the interests of the public are in the long run identical. Business is a mode of social functioning. Men unite in business units, not only for the purpose of making money, but also for the purpose of obtaining a living—what they regard as the right kind of living. To perform their tasks properly, business enterprises must operate as integrated units. This means that all the parts within each unit must play together and that each unit must be more or less in perfect accord with its outer environment. Where the situation is otherwise, business undertakings fail to function properly, and a diseased condition is created in the body social.

Money-making and society-making often clash. The translation of private gain into public welfare does not always automatically occur. Every day sees business establishments failing to operate as social institutions both within and without. Scores of business men seem to care more for the magnitude of rewards than for human values. But reasoned Mr. H. A. Overstreet in the prosperous twenties before he came to the conclusion that we should cast "the profit-economy" overboard: "The healthy business will seek in every possible way to organize itself in such a manner that both within itself and in its relation to its environing public, it clearly establishes an identity rather than a sharp opposition of interests."

The service which those engaged in business render is reciprocal service. Service possesses a twofold meaning. In the first place, it may mean expenditure of effort without expectation of reward. In the second place, it may mean expenditure of effort in which both exchanger and exchangee are benefited. The first type of service is based purely on the notion of altruism; it flows in one direction only. The second type of service is economic service and represents a movement in two directions; it implies an interchange of values. When the business man either buys *or* sells goods or buys *and* sells goods, he renders economic service. What he gives is paid for by what he gets, and what he gets is paid for by what he gives. The service he renders benefits both parties to the transaction.

The profits of business represent social as well as personal benefits. No business can long survive that operates at a loss. When corporate or other types of concerns constantly ignore deficits, they are headed toward failure, and failure represents not only private but also public loss.

Business, like every other social project, justifies its existence by the public functions which it performs. The best business man is the man who serves society best. The best society is the society that possesses the best businesses—the best mechanisms for satisfying its economic needs. Society does not exist for business. Business exists for society.

The public benefits which have accrued from the economy of private profits are of many kinds. Private business has developed public respect for technological expertness. The rise of industrialism is due to modern science. Manufacturing is not a matter of mere trial and error; we did not reach the industrial heights we have achieved by accident, by magic, or by dependence upon political leaders. The economic progress which we have made is the result of invention, technical skill, scientific precision. We have learned in technological realms what to do and how to do it; and in that method of learning we have acquired a high regard for fact, for natural laws, for cause and effect. While our forebears depended upon the instruments of violence, of religion, and of govern-

ment, we depend upon the instruments of science—pure as well as applied science. If we desire to improve in any way the world in which we live, we do not call either upon the gods or upon the military and political strategists but upon the scientists—chemists, physicists, inventors, engineers, technicians.

Private business has taught us "the art of living together." The economic organization of modern society is both coöperative and competitive. Business units engaged in the same line not only compete but also coöperate with each other through codes and trade associations against other units engaged in different lines. Moreover, every business coöperates with every other business in carrying out economic processes as a whole. Today economic effort is largely socialized effort. The operation of banks, of trading enterprises, and of manufacturing establishments is collective in character. Corporations, socially as well as legally, are coöperative undertakings.

The United States as well as other industrial nations has shifted from agrarian to urban modes of living. The changes incident thereto have forced us to assume new attitudes, to acquire new ways of thinking, to adopt new types of conduct. Urban civilization requires us mutually to accommodate ourselves to each other, to be considerate of the weaker members of society, to adjust ourselves to crowds, to practice courteousness, and to recognize obligations to others. No longer are we dominated by the philosophy of unrestrained individualism. The rights and privileges of the many increasingly take precedence over the rights and privileges of the few.

The economy of private business has contributed to "the prolongation of youth." In earlier centuries young people entered upon their vocational tasks at early ages. Preparation for occupational activities was simple; either apprenticeship or training by parents requiring only a brief space of time was all that was necessary. But with the advent of machine industry and the consequent coming of complex specialized forms of economic activity, the period of preparation was greatly extended. Today it takes many years of elementary,

high school, college, and professional education before individuals may enter the various professions or may become bankers, manufacturers, merchants, or other types of producers. While, as some one has observed, a cat spends one-twelfth of its life as a kitty, and a dog spends one-ninth of its life as a puppy, the human being, due to the complexities of modern civilization, spends one-third of his life as a child, or rather as an apprentice, preparing to assume the serious responsibilities of the business of living. But this extension of the period of youth is not individually wasteful; neither is it socially wasteful; on the contrary, it is individually and socially beneficial, since it affords everyone sufficient time for the assimilation of the arts and sciences and the cultures of the present as well as the past, and since it provides opportunity "for experiments with ideas and for orientation in the life-processes."

The system of private profits has demonstrated the value—the social value—of organized effort. The economic development of America is the result of uniting men and machines into wealth-creating combinations. Natural resources by themselves are worthless; they must be developed; they must be utilized, directed, and controlled. Business performs these tasks, and in performing them has given us experience with large-scale operations, financial and commercial, as well as technological. We have learned to think in terms of large structures, wide areas, vast aggregations of labor and capital. We have moved from simple to complex economic organization. We have acquired the capacity to organize our energies and to make them count, whether those energies be expended for economic ends or for non-economic ends.

The mechanism of money-making has created public recognition of life values. While the factory system has ushered in a multitude of new occupational hazards, it has also greatly improved general physical well-being; it has supplied new means to fight sickness and death; it has provided funds to endow hospitals and health research foundations; it has fabri-

cated delicate devices for the use of surgeons; it has developed better and wider varieties of foodstuffs; it has perfected adequate systems of sanitation; it has improved water supplies; it has made the world a healthier as well as a safer place in which to live. Life underwriters in particular have stressed life values and have done much to promote health and longevity. Likewise, advertising, even in spite of its defects, has from every billboard and magazine helped to make us nationally health conscious. Public health itself is a product of private business since funds for its maintenance owe their origin primarily to taxation of wealth and income. It is not a mere coincidence that the United States is the richest as well as the healthiest country in the world.

The institution of private profits has supplied business enterprisers with motives to conquer new worlds as well as old, and to achieve positions—public as well as private—which satisfy. The motives of human beings, whether in the present or in the past, are difficult to analyze. The business man, like every other man, is moved not by one but by a mass of motives. The way in which he acts or reacts is prompted by a number of forces. He is not guided by one all-absorbing passion. When he buys and sells goods or services, when he hires and fires labor, or when he organizes new or reorganizes old enterprises, he is not necessarily stimulated directly in every case by the one incentive of profit and that incentive only. Other incentives, either immediate or remote, may be equally influential and may serve to explain his conduct.

On the level, the business man may look as if he is wholly submerged in his own immediate undertakings. To outsiders he may seem to behold only the glitter of gold, to seek only speedy implements for the acquisition of dollars, to strive only for complete conquests of commercial communities, and yet he may not be at all what he seems. He may have his attention directed toward goals that are far beyond. He may merely regard private business as a means magnificent to reach more remote and satisfying objectives.

It has been argued that "we must guard against attribut-

ing the motives of a man's total self to that part of him which is engaged in business." In business, it is contended, a man is actuated by certain motives, while outside of business he is actuated by entirely different motives. He may without stint give self as well as wealth to community projects which produce no private return to himself; he may devote his energies, without hope of personal gain, to the amelioration of social or other ills; but he leaves this part of him behind when he enters the marts of trade, the portals of banks, or the doors of manufacturing plants.

While this notion may possess a measure of merit, it must be remembered that a man cannot be so easily dismembered; he cannot be explained in halves. If he is anything at all, he is a unity. He has many organs and each perform a different function, but he is nevertheless a man, a unit, an indivisible being. Harmony must exist between his business and non-business parts. His motives as a totality cohere and ultimately guide him toward objectives which he deems desirable, whether deemed so by others or not.

Not all business men are impelled by the same motives. Some selfishly serve themselves by disregarding the interest of every one else; others assume an entirely different attitude and seek to serve themselves by serving their employees, their customers, and the general public. It is doubtful if any two business enterprisers are exactly alike. Likewise, it is doubtful if any two would exactly agree on why they entered the field of business or why they have remained.

Motives are closely related to what is called the dominant urges of man. These urges are two types: those that are organic and those that are social. Organic urges are those that are aroused primarily by inner physical conditions, such as the urge to secure food when hungry, the urge to drink when thirsty, or the urge to sleep when drowsy; they arise only in response to the stimuli of bodily needs. But these do not represent all the dominant urges. There are other urges equally influential in motivating human activity. These urges represent the acquisitive impulses: the desire to excel, to fight

interference, to beget children; the drives to relieve suffering, to secure sympathy, to win social approval.

Dominant urges are dynamic; they bespeak action; they influence feeling, thinking, conscious effort. In them motives have their origin, their history, their complete explanation. A motive involves a stimulus within or without which compels an urge to respond. It is the bridge which connects impulses on the one side with the means that will bring satisfying effects on the other. A man is motivated when an inner state or an outer condition predisposes him to react in a given way.

Business men are no different from other men. Normally they respond in the same way as other men respond. When they go into business, they do so, not because they may be altogether consumed with a desire for wealth as such, but because they respond either directly or indirectly to universal impulses of one kind or another.

The possibility of pecuniary gain is a stimulus—it has always been a very effective stimulus in the past—which arouses the organism—the business enterpriser—to activity. A stimulus produces either an annoying situation which we strive to avoid or sets in motion a craving which we strive to gratify. We always seek to dodge that which disturbs and to secure that which satisfies. The system of private profits always points—has always pointed—toward this end. Consequently, this system supplies business owners and managers with motives not only to escape circumstances which irritate and achieve positions—public as well as private—which satisfy, but also to conquer new worlds as well as old.

The possible acquisition of private profits has enabled individual business men as well as the masses to achieve high standards of living. Those who have turned to business rather than to some other occupation did so because they thought they could obtain greater returns therein than they could obtain elsewhere. To most people the satisfaction of survival needs is not sufficient. Fullness of life requires more than food, clothes, and shelter. Reasonable access to comforts and luxuries, a certain amount of leisure, and freedom from eco-

conomic insecurity are imperative if one would live abundantly. Private business makes it possible readily to reach these goals, especially since it usually provides in normal periods greater material rewards more quickly attained than other vocations.

The hope of pecuniary reward has stimulated thousands to make adequate provisions for old age—adequate for themselves as well as for others. There are few persons who can look with calmness toward old age. Most of us fear growing old. We refuse to believe in the optimism of him who said: "Grow old along with me, the best of life is yet to be." We prefer the tangible present to the intangible future. We dread reaching the time when we will cease to be productive. When advanced age prevents us from paying our own way, we do not want to be a burden either upon our offspring or upon the public. We desire to be independent, to retain our self-respect, and to provide fully *ourselves* for *ourselves*.

Numbers of individuals have made their bows to business rather than to other occupations in which they might have better exhibited their natural bents, simply because they were disturbed by these recurring notions. They felt the economic necessity of sacrificing personal inclination for personal safety. Business, they concluded, offered the surest road to a lifetime competence, and they acted accordingly. They, therefore, selected business rather than professional, literary, or artistic pursuits primarily because they wanted to make the world safe for old age—safe for their old age as well as the old age of others.

The quest for profits in America has often been a quest for social prestige. The impulse to win social approval is a basic urge. Every person, old or young, great or small, in business or outside of business, craves the approving words, smiles and attitudes of other people; he wants to be recognized as somebody of importance. Command over wealth in a large way contributes to this recognition. Possessors of property are preëminent figures whether in Wall Street or in Main Street. Social distinction attaches to every man of

business achievement, and the greater the achievement the greater the social distinction.

Private business has undoubtedly attracted scores of its most powerful adherents for this very reason. Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Sr., was quoted at Ormond Beach, Florida, two or three years ago, as saying: " 'Tis better to secure acclaim than riches." Did Mr. Rockefeller mean that he himself had followed this adage? His record would hardly lead one to think so. Apparently the acclaim which he has secured is the result of, rather than a substitute for, riches. I wonder if he, as well as other notable characters in American business, both in the present and in the past, may not have chosen their vocations, not as a means of mere wealth getting, but rather as a medium through which to secure social approval.

Success in business leads to power—public as well as private power. The making of profits plus the institution of private property has made it possible for human beings to secure wealth, to hold on to it, and ultimately to transmit it to their progeny. This means power to control persons as well as things. Many individuals have selected business vocations, not for financial returns per se, but for the influence which these returns afford. "Desire for social distinction and the love of power," concluded Professor Henry R. Seager many years ago, "have little influence on the attitude of the average man toward working life, but in the minds of those who rise to the highest positions in the business world these become dominant motives."

That business hitherto has satisfied man's craving for conquest is not difficult to understand. Business is a matter of might, a war of wits, a device of daring; it exploits natural resources; it clears the forests; it tunnels through mountains; it turns deserts into gardens; it harnesses Niagara Rivers; it digs Panama Canals; it establishes pathways through the air. Indeed, business subdues the earth—the physical earth—and "molds it nearer to the heart's desire." Business, therefore, as no other occupation, calls for action; it beckons, as no other

calling, to those who are urged by impulses to compete, to command, to conquer.

Private business has provided Americans with opportunity for the gratification of their creative instincts. Every great achievement, whether in art or in literature, whether in business or in statesmanship, is a product of mind as well as matter; its inception as well as its execution is largely mental—largely as result of creative cerebration. Everyone to a greater or lesser degree feels the urge to produce something that is distinctive. The business man is no exception. Private business offers just as much outlet for creative impulses as other pursuits. Art is not confined to great paintings, great music, great books, or great orations. All men are artists in so far as they are driven by feelings of beauty, by desires for self-expression, by instincts of craftsmanship. The merchant, the manufacturer, or the manager of vast properties may be just as truly an artist as the painter, the composer, the writer, or the musician.

Moreover, private business has laid the foundations upon which we have erected the superstructure of American culture. The United States due to its wealth has gone much further and accomplished much more than most other nations. The economic progress we have made has not only resulted in higher standards of living for the masses of the people but also in a wider diffusion of the good things of life in general. Private fortunes have been accumulated with great rapidity; but they have in a multitude of cases been used not for the sole benefit of those who created them but for the benefit of the nation, or of particular parts of the nation. In various sections of the country we see colleges and universities, art museums, research foundations, churches, parks, and other public or semi-public properties which carry the names of, or in one way or another have been made possible by, families of wealth. The city itself with its great contributions to modern life, as well as public schools, public roads, public buildings, and other public properties and activities, has arisen out of the functionings of private business. The level

of our national wealth has determined largely the level of our national culture.

Private profits in the long run perform public functions. Business enterprises serve all members of society as well as their promoters, their directors, and their dividend receivers. We depend in the present, as we have depended in the past, primarily upon individual business initiative to get what we want, to guide economic effort, and to keep in balance wealth production and wealth consumption. The economy of private profits is the social institution which we have perfected to stimulate this initiative; it may not be a perfect institution; it may have its serious disadvantages as well as its advantages; it may periodically break down; it may need at times drastic overhauling; it may even be necessary to limit increasingly the opportunities which it affords to build and maintain huge fortunes or to earn huge incomes; but it has given us in America what we have materially and has made us largely what we are culturally and spiritually.

WILD-HEART: AN APPRECIATION OF EMILY JANE BRONTË

RALPH AIKEN

THERE are some of us who love the somber, not the murderous or the insane of Russian barbarisms but the twilight melancholy of romantic cruelty or frustrated hopes. It is supposedly a Celtic trait of character, the robust Saxon or the light-hearted Latin having little appreciation of the poetically disheartened. The Scottish Highlanders are inclined by nature to sadness. Fiona Macleod tells us that we may come upon a little Highlander seated beside the road bathed in tears and his only explanation will be: "I have a gloom." This native melancholy may be attributed to the reaction of a sensitive racial mind to rigorous and bleak surroundings. The barren hills and rocky soil, the whipping winds of winter, the grey, oppressing clouds, the rain, combine to plant in the mind not only an appreciation of the tragic but a love for it. What true Highlander would have his mountains gay and sunny?

There are other parts of the earth as bleak and cheerless as Scotland, but they do not seem to affect in the same way the men who dwell therein. Norway is a barren and inhospitable land, but one cannot readily imagine an impassioned lamentation from the lips of a Scandinavian. Hardly any locality is more desolate than Greenland, but the Eskimos are not noted for grimness or intensity of feeling. The Celtic type of mind, on the other hand, seems easily molded sentimentally and impressed by grim Nature; the sensitive, intensely loyal, intensely native Celt often loves the forlorn and finds in it a religious exhilaration. And, indeed, after centuries of mist and misery, the Celt, wherever he may find himself, is apt to carry in his breast a dormant agony of soul, needing only the proper touch of sternness in man or woman, the sky, the sea, or the storm, to waken that strain of the

unearthly poignant which is his fundamental inheritance. Among many examples which might be cited of this nervous characteristic hardly any could be more interesting than one particular Celt among Celts, a Gael among Gaels, who never saw Ireland and never saw Scotland but who drew, for the astonishment of the English people, an exquisite exhibition of a Celtic reaction to nature, human and inhuman.

Emily Jane Brontë has been accused of many things, from having a fit in her mother's death-chamber and producing therefrom a "seraph-comforter" who later became a "seraph-demon," even to being in love with her father and vengefully developing the worst of imaginary characters as a prototype of thwarted devotion. She was born in 1818, many decades before psychologists might have soothed her temperament, and she was able to produce a few poems and *Wuthering Heights*, a thrillingly fiendish book with a fiend for a hero, before she died in 1848.

The appraisal of genius is so likely to call forth the cynical or absurd that one hesitates to add anything more to Emily's guilty eccentricities. Nevertheless, despite the natural English wonderment over her passionate wild character, a fairly simple motivation for her repressed and rugged life and her inexcusable book presents itself. Emily loved sadness. She loved it passionately. She loved it wholly and entirely. She loved it for the keen and searing sweetness that it brought to her romantic soul in its narrow and unfulfilled existence. Sadness, loneliness, hatred and cruelty she loved better than life itself. Sadness was life, to her. It is well enough to explain this weakness for the tragic by attributing it to a neglected childhood and a jealousy of her brother. But so thorough an appreciation of elemental harshness needs more than external causes to root it so deeply in the nature. Cheerful men and women develop from most unpromising beginnings, and early neglect, unless extreme, usually results in nothing worse than certain idiosyncrasies.

Emily's nature could not have been so impressed by her childhood experiences alone. She may have felt herself neg-

lected, she may have felt herself an outcast at an early age, but her feelings were part of her character, and her character did not develop from her feelings. The racial tendencies of the Celt, more than any mere experiences in her retired life, were responsible for her passionate delight in unsheathing the ecstatic from the terrible. It is far from usual for those who love the lugubrious to confess to any happiness in it, and it is impossible to imagine that Emily would ever state that she liked to be sad. Emily was the most reserved of her unusual family. To tell anything about herself was characteristically impossible. Even her poems were discovered by violence. It is not the habit of the Gael to state his mysteries in so many words and so make an end of mystery.

But in spite of her withdrawal from all human contact in her own most cherished thoughts there was that in her character which frustrated complete isolation. The unimaginative who are reserved may preserve their hidden natures inviolate throughout their lives, but the imaginative are ever pressed to express themselves. They must expose in some form the heights of creative art they may have touched. Such an expression is ever a delight, but with a person like Emily it was a delight that had to be kept wholly to herself. Revelation would have frozen her freedom of expression. After her poems were brought to light she wrote but little more.

Under the irresistible necessity for expression Emily poured out in her poems those thoughts in which she found the greatest stimulation and pleasure. As an imaginative genius she saw herself easily as another person. She clothed herself with all adventure and all passion and all experience. And she shaped her imaginings to kindle her heart with excitement and joy. Her poems betray Emily. They are with few exceptions somber or melancholy. The descriptions of native scenes and surroundings are perhaps the most cheerful, but even here the moments painted are mostly those of autumn or winter, of storm or stress, or else they but lead to some contrasting regret. Even if the sun shines, it is a pitiless sun,

if the wind is low and gentle, it is pensive; if the starlight is soft, it is also fraught with anticipated anguish.

He comes with western wind, with evening's wandering airs
With that clear dusk of heaven that brings the thickest stars.
Winds take a pensive tone and stars a tender fire,
And visions rise, and change, that kill me with desire.

And when the sun sets he fails to set in glory. There can be no glory for Emily Brontë that is not flashed in some burst of passion.

O Evening! why is thy light so sad?
Why is the sun's last ray so cold?

Even this:

It was a pleasant April day
Declining to the afternoon;
Sunshine upon her pillow lay
As warm as middle June.

is merely used to heighten the tragedy of the realization of death.

Emily is almost uniformly tragic in her poetry. A gay love note she never struck, although many of her poems are about love and she cherished an ideal of deathless affection. A simple pastoral expression of happiness she once or twice let slip, but her greater joy was to turn to the wildness of nature that corresponded to her own wild spirit:

There is a spot, 'mid barren hills,
Where winter howls and drives the rain.

The courageous, the inspiringly moral, even the familiar and homelike, held no attraction for her, unless clothed in an atmosphere of stress and human defeat and despair. When she turned to these secret thoughts of hers, her world of heroic misfortune, to breathe the songs that were for her ear alone, or for those of her imagined companions, she was prepared to feel and revel in the penetrating enchantment of Celtic melancholy.

I have sat lonely all the day,
Watching the drizzling mist descend,
And first conceal the hills in grey,
And then along the valleys wend.

At the end of such a day she could well embody her expression in some throbbing or tempestuous poem that draws out to the full her exquisite appreciation of the somber.

Why did she choose to write 180 or more grave or tragic poems out of 185 that we know her to have written? It must be because she liked to write that particular kind of poetry, that she liked to be sad and express sadness. She took no pleasure in the carefree and hearty, but she did delight in the deathly and unrestrained. Yet in her daily life she was no pessimistic or morbid soul. Queer, indeed, and stern, but not melancholy though her poetic interests naturally centered in that quality. Hers was the spirit of the storm, of swirling clouds and driving snow, but bred as she was in a thoroughly respectable and narrow English parsonage her nature must of necessity be driven to concealment. Only in her beloved imaginary world could she voice the longings and delights that stirred her real being. By rights she should have been some Gaelic prophetess living five hundred years before and swaying her clan with songs of vengeance and despair. But in the year 1845 in the West Riding of York there was no world to which she could naturally appeal; there was no outlet for the fierce energy of her spirit. She could merely sing of the mournful and the strange and let her imagination answer the elemental savagery within her.

There is nothing unusual in such a character developing from the Celtic Brontë ancestry. The point is that Emily had the gift of literary expression and was able to exhibit her untrammelled spirit in the light of such romance as shines around the Highland minstrel or the Irish harpist. Even her sisters, who had gifts of the same passion, recognized what a strange being Emily was. She could not wholly conform to civilized ways and manners. She might dress and eat and sleep as the English were wont, but her heart was on the moors, her longings were to the wild creatures there, and her joy was in the storm. Charlotte liked to hear the wind "wuthering" about the house while she sat safe within, but

Emily liked to be out in the middle of the gale, straining against it and glorying in it.

She had small patience with the folk around her; they were no kin to her. They could never see her visions or know her innate ecstasies. There was nothing of the untamed in them to bring them to her or to arouse her eager interests. She met them coldly when she had to or not at all when she could manage it. Even her sisters, whom she really loved, were time and again rebuffed by her hapless bearing. She was a wild thing, and sometimes there was no reconciling the brutal in her that longed to be free of every tie and bond. When she was taken, once or twice, to more civilized surroundings, to Miss Wooler's school or to Brussels, her desire for the open moors and what liberty she had known at home became insupportable, and she quickly had to return. How would she have acted had she been sent to wilder parts than Haworth, to Inverness, to Skye, or the Shetlands? Would nostalgia have overcome her then, and would she have longed with breaking heart for

A little and a lone green lane
That opened on a common wide;
A distant, dreamy, dim blue chain
Of mountains circling every side?

For all her pleasure in the forlorn, Emily was neither sad nor depressed by nature. She was grave and reserved, but she could be and often was both gay and sprightly. She was a formidably energetic character and probably a clear and accurate thinker. She was quite the man of the family, capable of handling her brother in his drunken rages, and not afraid to do it. In fact, she seemed never to evince fear of any sort; how could one who gloried in the turbulent and harsh ever know what fear was!

The Brontës are supposed to have led a most unhappy and crushed existence, but that is because they all died young and near together. Yet for twenty-three years there was no death in the family, and during that time the children probably experienced as much happiness as most children of the time

and place did. Emily, at least, was no pining flower, sickly in its bloom. Her sister Charlotte says: "She found in the bleak solitude many and dear delights; and not the least and best loved was—liberty." Indeed, her nature was brave and stalwart even to the very hour of her death, but her pleasure was sad. She might have been the daughter of a Celtic chief gifted with an English tongue, and the immemorial pathos of a defeated race lived in her thoughts.

Because her imagination was heroic and she conceived of tragedy on a grand scale, the theme of torment was her favorite one; and whether the anguish was caused by imprisonment, by separation, by death, or by remembrance, she made of it something more than human. In the more caustic sufferings caused by the relations between human beings Emily could give full rein to her romantic longings. She raised human affection to a transcendent height and made her sexless and impassioned ideal of love an example of ceaseless yearning. Seeing the stultified and commonplace in human beings around her, she realized that such love as she imagined was not to be found on earth and her strained and thirsting concept of devotion must needs be exalted in the breast of some demon or seraph, demi-god or demi-devil.

No human could possibly answer as a fit mate for Emily. He must ride the storm and conquer the wild and crush the conventional, however good, and find his very life in the cold and beating blasts of liberty, of isolation, and of freedom. And above all he must love as never man loved, with a devotion so overpowering, so constant, so all-absorbing as to be the very reason and cause of his existence. He must sweep everything aside to fulfill that devotion, and separation from the object of his affections must be the utmost he could suffer in torture.

Emily was no gentle romanticist. Her idea of devotedness seethed with all the turbulent, uncontrolled, poignant emotions of an unrestrained creature of nature. It was so great, so foaming, and so furious that she could see no curbing good in it. Yet even if it were wholly evil, this ideal would still be the very life-blood of her heart. With such a grandeur of

imagined passion often in her thought, she was certain to embed that ideal as the very backbone of any story she might write. Already it had run through her poems written years before, and if she arrived at a time when she wanted to express the attraction between the sexes in a tale, the passion of it would naturally be of the kind she gloried in—violent, ferocious, ungovernable, something primordial, something unthinkable. Such passion could not be expressed in an atmosphere of lightsomeness and good. It must of necessity be dark and over-powering and cruel. Were it otherwise it would be no conception of Emily Brontë's, no child of her imagination.

And so she chose the desolate surroundings of her native Yorkshire, and the isolated gentlefolk of her distant acquaintance and let loose upon them a darling of her fantasy, her glorified ideal of an imagined lover, to run his course of hatred, cruelty, conflict and overpowering passion. This creature of hers, this more than man, looks out in her poems here and there, but it was only when she came to write *Wuthering Heights* that she portrayed him in all his vast emotions, and gave life and plausibility to something unhuman and impossible. She is pictured writing her novel, white-faced and unconscious of her surroundings, and well she might be in the unfoldment of her tremendous dreams. It was a book written *con amore*, a revelation of an inner life all ghastly to the cheerful social eye, but full of strange, ecstatic thrills for those few who recoil but with delight from the stings of romantic cruelty.

Why should Emily Brontë be called the "sphinx" of English literature or an "enigma"? Is it so strange to find joy in suffering, oppression, frustration, harshness? Is there no fascination in thunder and disaster? Is there no draining sweetness in overwhelming cold desire? Or is it that such thoughts are impossible to a woman, particularly the child of a secluded parsonage? Is it inexplicable because she could not have experienced what she described? As a matter of fact genius does not need actual experience to make its analysis vivid and life-

like. Imagination and logic are potent factors in delineating the actually unknown. Genius may change its sex as readily as a garment and represent a man or woman with equal ease. And the most secluded of individuals may dream even the dreams of Dante or Milton.

The only enigmatical point about Emily Brontë is that which is enigmatical about every genius: how it develops and how it manages to display itself. But criticism is never happy unless it can find some twig of experience or influence on which to hang its little explanations. Despite the slurs of singularly unpleasing psycho-analysts there seems to have been little of the morbid in Emily Brontë and nothing of the moribund. She was no weak woman; far from it. She was not melancholy save as it pleased her; she was not sad except in the pleasure of it. She was strong, so strong that she never looked for aid to any one. So iron in her nature that she fought tuberculosis without help and probably without hope, but she stood alone to the last.

She turned to the storm because it was hers; she turned to the desolate and dreary because they awoke sympathetic longings; she contemplated the outcast and cruel as her own because she came of a long race of the outcast and cruelly treated; and she looked upon true romantic devotion as beyond all earthly experience.

All this renders her comprehensible, at least as much as genius can be comprehended. *Wuthering Heights* is a work of art displaying her mind. The forces of passion enveloped her imagination, and with her clear and penetrating power of expression she could present them to the humbler minds of all of us. What if she revealed to us a hell? It is a hell but at the same time a heaven of tremulous excitement and intensity. How could it be otherwise when the scenes are painted for us by a brilliant imagination stimulated by a deep-seated pleasure in romantic cruelty?

ROBERT E. LEE*

WILLIAM K. BOYD

IN MARCH, 1861, Robert E. Lee, Colonel in the United States Army, was offered a commission as Brigadier General in the Army of the Confederate States of America. This offer he either ignored or refused. The following month, on April 18, he was offered command of the large army of the United States, soon to be called into the field by President Lincoln. This he also declined, but two days later resigned his commission and shortly after accepted an appointment as Major General in charge of the military and naval forces of Virginia. Thus the hour and the man met. He was not placed in command of the army of Northern Virginia until June, 1862, but soon thereafter he became the idol of its rank and file, his military ability the hope of the Confederacy. Since the close of the war he has represented the ideal of a section; in his personality the South has seen portrayed all that is best in the life and character of its people. Hundreds of eulogies and a score of biographies have attested his place in popular esteem. How well merited is this praise? To what extent can eulogy stand the test of unbiased criticism? Up to the present, the biographies of Lee have been mainly laudatory. In course of time this eulogistic trend in popular biography had to be subordinated to fact, and a definitive life of the great character had to be produced. Both of these ends have now been accomplished in Mr. Winston's fine impartial study and in Mr. Freeman's comprehensive four volumes. In no previous books on Lee have so many footnotes been used; in none has the critical attitude been so dominant. But the entire absence of eulogy in Mr. Winston's volume serves to emphasize rather than weaken the old impression of strength

* *Robert E. Lee: A Biography.* By Robert W. Winston. New York, William Morrow and Co. 1934. xi, 428 pp.

Robert E. Lee: A Biography. By Douglas Southall Freeman. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons. 1934. 4 vols. xiv, 647; 621; 559; 594 pp.

and nobility; while Mr. Freeman's work, which is far more factual, tracing to its lair, as it does, every possible detail of Lee's life, still reveals nothing to contradict the essential greatness of character as portrayed by other authors. A more thorough analysis and proportioned appraisal, rather than a change in interpretation, is the result. And that analysis and appraisal impinge on three themes—Lee's personality, his military genius, and his attitude toward the problems of Virginia and the South.

I

Of the forces that moulded Lee's character, both authors emphasize the power of family tradition. Paternally, he belonged to a line established in Virginia by Richard Lee during the first half of the seventeenth century. Every effort to establish a definite connection between the Lees of Virginia and any line in England has failed. In the new world, the family through several generations displayed two traits—a tendency to maintain or improve social position through advantageous marriages, and to gain leadership in the public service. Richard Lee was County Justice, Burgess, Secretary of the Colony, and member of the Council; his son, Richard, was also Burgess and Councilor; Henry Lee, great grandfather of Robert Edward, was colonel of militia; Henry Lee, his grandfather, was Burgess and member of Revolutionary committees; the father, "Lighthorse Harry" Lee, was a distinguished soldier of the Revolution and governor of Virginia for three terms. Other members of the family also were in the public service, and their contribution to that service is well summarized by Mr. Freeman:

From Richard Lee, the immigrant, through the sixth generation, that of Robert E. Lee, fifty-four male members of the Stratford line are known to have lived to maturity. Five of them were professional men who did not hold office. Of the remaining forty-nine, thirty-seven had some record of public service. These thirty-seven included ten burgesses, ten members of the state legislature, six professional soldiers, three naval officers, six militia officers, six members of the colonial council, four members of Revolutionary conventions, three governors

or acting governors, two signers of the Declaration of Independence, two diplomatists, three members of the Continental Congress, three members of the United States Congress, one member of the United States Cabinet, one secretary of the colony, one London alderman, one town mayor, one judge, five justices of the peace, two clerks and one deputy clerk of courts, and two prosecuting attorneys—a total of seventy-two offices.

Distinguished as were the Lees, both biographers give a distinctive influence to the maternity of Robert Edward. His mother, Anne Carter Lee, belonged to a family not so distinguished in the public service as the Lees, but widely influential; and singularly, the five daughters of "King Carter" became the ancestors of three signers of the Declaration of Independence, three governors of Virginia, and two presidents of the United States. Thrift, self-control, and a deep religious sense characterized the Carters, and these qualities were all important in the case of Robert Edward Lee, for his father, though distinguished as a soldier, was temperamentally unfitted for success in civil life; broken in fortune, he went into voluntary exile, leaving to his wife the problem of rearing the children. So it was the mother's guidance, not that of the father, that shaped the early years of the son who achieved greatness. And the finer qualities of the ancestors seem to have been dominant in Lee's inheritance, the weaker qualities subordinated—devotion to Virginia, an instinct for management, military prowess, religion, self-control, and economy.

Lee's religious sense, which developed rapidly after the Mexican War, contributed beyond measure to his attitudes and his influence. His was an Anglican, evangelical faith. He had a simple, profound consciousness of God and of things here below shaped by Him; and among His children there must be love, kindness and humility. This left an impression on his conduct of war. The common soldier was quick to sense in his commander a rare friendliness and consideration that numerous anecdotes of the war illustrated. Add to these qualities success in battle, and hero-worship was the result. Toward the deserter or those accused of espionage Lee

was unusually considerate and humane. Significant also was his attitude toward the Union troops. He never spoke of them as "Yankees" or as "the enemy"; they were "those people." Once when an officer expressed a wish that all the enemy were dead, Lee replied, "How can you say that? Now, I wish that they all were at home attending to their business and leaving us to do the same."

Such a man was attracted by the pomp and glory of war. More than once he dared personally to lead troops in combat, but was forced to the rear. Yet for excessive shedding of blood he had strong aversion. Illustrative were his words at Fredericksburg: "It is well that war is so terrible—else we should grow too fond of it." And he wrote to his wife on Christmas day, 1862: "But what a cruel thing is war; to separate and destroy families and friends and mar the purest joys and happiness God has permitted us in this world; to fill our hearts with hatred instead of love for our neighbors, and to devastate the fair face of this beautiful world."

Too often has the Christian warrior taken to himself the quality of an avenging God; not so with Lee. He was not vengeful, but merciful, desiring not the enemy's destruction, but an inclination in his heart toward peace.

II

The reaction of such a personality to the political and social forces of his time raises questions of greater interest than his particular genius for military leadership. Specifically, what were Lee's attitudes toward secession, the objectives of the war, and the real adjustments after the fighting ended?

He was not a political philosopher and had no pet theories. In such matters the power of tradition was apt to shape his course. Henry Lee, his father, had been a Federalist, and in the debates of the Virginia legislature concerning the famous Virginia Resolutions of 1798 he was an outspoken nationalist, holding that the Constitution of the United States was a product of the people, not of the states. It was therefore logical for his son to reject secession as a constitutional right, to re-

gard it as an act of revolution. Nor did he believe that the grievances of the South in 1860 warranted revolution. He therefore did not accept the commission offered in the Army of the Confederate states. On the other hand, he did hold that President Lincoln's call for troops was an act of coercion, as revolutionary as secession itself, and he could not conscientiously accept a commission from his government. In the crisis Lee's social bond was the determining factor in his decision. He was a Virginian and could not see his state coerced, and after the Virginia Convention submitted to the people the ordinance of secession, he cast his lot with his state, accepting the commission as Major General of the Virginia forces. Mr. Winston sees here a conflict of loyalties, and to it he devotes an excellent chapter. But to Mr. Freeman there was no conflict; the logic of Lee's action was too simple to require elaborate demonstration. Yet it should be remembered that there were Virginians to whom the obligation was just the reverse, and they fought with the Union. Among them there were kinsmen of Lee.

Toward certain aspects of the political conduct of the war, Lee's opinions were at variance with the administration, though he made no issue of the matter. In the angling for foreign intervention he had no sympathy, believing that the South must rely for victory on its own resources. To him the best political policy was to stimulate the peace sentiment in the North. Twice he recommended this to President Davis—when Maryland was first invaded in September, 1862, he urged a peace proposal, and on the eve of the second invasion he again broached the matter. Mr. Winston concludes that Lee would have welcomed a complete restoration of the Union through compromise; not so with Mr. Freeman, who never goes beyond the plain statement by Lee of his opinions, and in Lee's communications there is expressed no hope or aim of a reunited country. Indeed, Mr. Winston emphasizes the contrast between President Davis and General Lee, their divergences in temperament, the difference between the perspec-

tives of their respective localities, the deep South and the tobacco states. Mr. Freeman does not read into the record these contrasts; rather he emphasizes the harmony of the two leaders, the fact that due to Lee's skillful deference to the President the two were able to work together in the conduct of the war.

Significant indeed was General Lee's perception of the relation of slavery to the war. A letter of July 6, 1864, addressed to President Davis and hitherto unpublished, makes this statement:

As far as I have been able to judge, this war presents to the European world but two aspects. A contest in which one party is contending for abstract slavery and the other against it, the existence of vital rights involved does not seem to be understood or appreciated. As long as this lasts we can expect neither sympathy nor aid. Nor can we expect the policy of any government toward us to be governed by any other consideration than that of self-interest.

It is not surprising, therefore, that Lee should favor the freeing of the slaves and enlisting them in the Confederate army, and this undoubtedly influenced the formation of Davis's opinion that the slaves should be drawn into the military ranks and given freedom as a reward for their services.

It was the years after 1865 that demonstrated the dominant qualities of Lee's character. The conflict over, let bygones be bygones, was his philosophy. His correspondence abounds with such statements as the following:

I think it wisest not to keep open the sores of war, but to follow the example of those nations who endeavored to obliterate the marks of civil strife, and to commit to oblivion the feelings it engendered.

All should unite in honest efforts to obliterate the effects of the war, and to restore the blessing of peace. They should remain, if possible, in the country; promote harmony and good feeling; qualify themselves to vote; and elect to the state and general Legislature wise and patriotic men, who will devote their abilities to the interests of the country, and the healing of all dissensions.

It should be the object of all to avoid controversy, to allay passion, (and) give full scope to reason and every kindly feeling. By doing this and encouraging our citizens to engage in the duties of life with all their heart and mind, with a determination not to be turned aside by thoughts of the past and fears of the future, our country will not only

be restored in material prosperity, but will be advanced in science, in virtue and in religion.

These utterances were not lip-service: in a private conversation he said, "I believe I may say, looking into my own heart and speaking as in the presence of God, that I have never known one moment of bitterness or resentment." However, his magnanimity did not close his eyes to the radicalism of the Reconstruction Act. "They (the Northern Reconstructionists) are working as though they wished to keep alive by their proposals in Congress the bad blood in the South against the North. If left alone the hostility which must be felt after such a war will rapidly decrease, but it may be continued by incessant provocation." Yet he made no public criticism and advised Virginians to submit to the Reconstruction Acts and to send their best men to the Reconstruction Convention, thus making the most of a distasteful situation. "Although the future is still dark, and the prospects gloomy, I am confident that, if we all unite in doing our duty, and earnestly work to extract what good we can out of the evil that now hangs over our dear land, the time is not distant when the angry cloud will be lifted from our horizon and the sun in his pristine brightness again shine forth."

The one time that he espoused a political cause was in 1868 when he signed a statement regarding Southern opinion, to be used in the Democratic campaign of that year. The document was written by A. H. Stuart, but its tenor throughout was that of Lee's preachments.

The great want of the South is peace. The people earnestly desire tranquility and restoration of the Union. They deplore disorder and excitement as the most serious obstacle to their prosperity. They ask a restoration of their rights under the Constitution. They desire relief from oppressive misrule. Above all, they would appeal to their countrymen for the re-establishment, in the Southern States, of that which has been justly regarded as the birth-right of every American, the right of self-government. Establish these on a firm basis, and we can safely promise, on behalf of the Southern people, that they will faithfully obey the Constitution and laws of the United States, treat the negro populations with kindness and humanity and fulfill every duty incumbent on peaceful citizens, loyal to the Constitution of their country.

Did General Lee, during his last years, absorb the constitutional philosophy of the Southern States' Rights school? "Yes," says Mr. Freeman; "No," says Mr. Winston. The evidence in question is twofold. Two Englishmen, Herbert C. Saunders and Lord Acton, sought Lee's opinion on political issues. The former made a memorandum of an interview, quoting Lee as holding secession to be a constitutional right. This Lee corrected to read "a constitutional maxim of the South," thus repudiating the statement of personal belief. The memorandum was made in 1866. But a few years later in a letter to Lord Acton Lee stated that the South fought for the liberties guaranteed by the Constitution, that the right of secession had been recognized in the North, and that the Union, founded on one of the rights of the states under the Constitution, should be held inviolate. Mr. Winston goes so far as to doubt Lee's authorship of this letter. Mr. Freeman finds evidence to support Lee's authorship and points out that he at least signed it. Perhaps the truth is that although General Lee never accepted the Constitutional right of secession, he was genuinely alarmed by the sweep of nationalism that followed the war and contrasted with it the Union and the Constitution as interpreted by the fathers of his country.

III

Concerning Lee's military career both works are unique. Mr. Winston's account of the campaigns of the war is objective, coordinating Union strategy with that of the Confederacy, giving just credit and criticism to both Lee and his opponents. Mr. Freeman's treatment is naturally more in detail, extending over more than two volumes. His method is to follow Lee's campaigns as Lee saw the military problems before him. There is an unusual power in such a presentation; the details are numerous and meticulous, but the interest is none the less sustaining. Indeed, never has such a comprehensive or compelling account of the Virginia campaign been given. The author makes no claim to technical or scientific knowledge of the art of warfare, but his conclusions regard-

ing Lee as a commander are worthy of the best military critic. Strategy was the General's forte, tactics his weakness; the latter he mastered but when that mastery was accomplished there was a dearth of subordinates to guide a proper execution. In the early stages of the war Lee held to the theory that the Commander-in-Chief should bring troops together at the right time and in the right place, leaving the direction of combat to generals of brigade or division. He thus left much to the discretion of subordinates. This policy succeeded at Chancellorsville; it failed at Gettysburg. Mr. Freeman carefully analyzes the elements of Lee's strategy as well as certain qualities of command that stand between strategy and tactics; but the question of tactics is given less analysis. Ultimate defeat is attributed, and justly, to a decimation of manpower and a failure of supplies. No genius could overcome these obstacles and the greatest tribute to Lee's generalship is that the war in Virginia lasted as long as it did.

The reader of these volumes must lay them down with some such reflection as this: that Robert E. Lee, though a great soldier, was fundamentally a Virginia gentleman of the old school, a lover of the land, a genial soul among his chosen friends, a man of peace. In the eighteenth century he would have adorned a county bench, would have had a seat in the House of Burgesses and have risen to the Executive Council. But Fate, financial reverses in his family, caused him to enter West Point. He became a professional soldier, achieving success and adulation. When military days were over, however, he looms in his true stature—that of the Virginia gentleman, devoted to his country, faithful to duty, living under restraint in years of public stress—and through it all a wise counselor and an educator of the youth of the land. His belonged to a type that has vanished with the transition from a plantation to an industrial economy. Like Washington, he personified the finest qualities in the plantation régime of America.

B · O · O · K · S

LETTERS OF GAMALIEL BRADFORD

THE LETTERS OF GAMALIEL BRADFORD, 1918-1931. Edited by Van Wyck Brooks. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1934. Pp. vii, 377. \$4.50.

In a quiet, old-fashioned house in Wellesley Hills, Massachusetts, Gamaliel Bradford lived the solitary life of a semi-invalid. Until his fiftieth year outside contacts were limited to a devoted group of intimate friends; in 1912 the publication of *Lee, the American* initiated him to a wider circle. Unable to get about with any sort of freedom, he resorted to letters, written, as he did all his work, on the type-writer. In 1918 he began to keep carbon copies of all letters. When he died, his stout, red-cloth letter-books containing the carbons included well over ten thousand sheets.

From these letter-books the editor selected the material in this volume with the avowed purpose of presenting a full and adequate picture of Bradford's later life. No letter written prior to 1918 is given, although to make up for the loss of the earlier picture the editor included a number of letters that throw light on Bradford's childhood, family history, and other matters of biographical interest. By a judicious selection from the array of correspondents the editor hoped to illustrate the wide range of Bradford's interests. He included intimate letters to Boston and Cambridge friends; letters to Professor Bliss Perry, Judge Robert Grant, and Professor E. K. Rand; to correspondents created by his interest in poetry, Shakespeare, and the minor Elizabethan dramatists; to students of his biographical method such as Professor Ambrose White Vernon; and to younger writers such as Mencken, Frost, Lindsay, Sandburg, Robinson, and Bacon. In accordance with the decided views of Bradford himself, the editor published the letters with as few excisions as possible and as few notes. It is left to the intelligent reader to supply or conjecture the annotations which generally accompany similar publications.

From the pages of these letters emerges a unique person, stubbornly courageous in a life-time struggle against physical illness that harassed him at every step. He is splendid in his power of frank and discerning criticism, keen in his interpretation of the post-war world viewed from his retreat, stimulating in his insatiable search for the unattainable goal of certainty. From these pages, also, emerges the picture of a man who failed where he most desired to succeed and succeeded in a field where he least cared to work.

He desired most of all to gain distinction by depicting the human heart through the medium of poetry, plays, or fiction. He dreamed of "rich, swift, glittering lines, trooping out of the dim abysses of" his "imagination," but the creative artist was lacking in him. He came gradually to see that he could depict the same human heart by taking actual subjects and after careful study and analysis portraying their characters with the broadest possible human sympathy and the most vivid power of picturesque and dramatic handling. And so, untrained in American history, undisciplined in scholarship, debarred by physical inability from research in archives, he stumbled into the field of American biography, and into a large measure of success.

Basing his work principally on diaries and letters, he discarded the inessential and, abandoning the chronological or even the narrative treatment, confined himself to what suggested, indicated, or portrayed the *grund* characteristics of his subject. Plagued with the urge for scientific accuracy of fact and haunted with the growing realization that absolute certainty in history is unattainable, he turned his history into an art. The scruple of meticulous truth grew more pronounced in him as he gained wider recognition, but it was on the structure of his portraits, the way in which they were conceived and put together, that he lavished his principal attention. Thus his biography-writing became a creative art, for, as he carefully explained, created characters in plays and novels are woven out of the observation exactly as his historical characters were evolved.

From his first breath of conscious intellectual life, the supreme thing in the world to Bradford was to gain recognition as a writer of poetry or fiction. And yet his plays and poems and novels were returned as "unsaleable" while the same publishers clamored for his prose portraits. Shortly before his death he was elected to the American Academy of Arts and Letters to occupy, not the chair of a poet or dramatist or novelist, but that of an historian, to succeed Edward Channing. To Bradford it was "a mad world."

ALAN K. MANCHESTER.

A BOOK WORTH READING

NEW FRONTIERS. By Henry A. Wallace. New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1934. Pp. 314. \$2.00.

This book is not typical of the volumes frequently published by high-ranking governmental officials. In the first place, it is really worth reading. Secondly, the author is in his own right a thinker whose

thoughts deserve consideration. And finally, this author, governmental official though he be, writes what he thinks frankly and squarely, rather than mouths what it is politic to think.

Henry A. Wallace, secretary of agriculture, is the type of man from whom straight thinking and forthright speech might be expected. He is the descendant of a grandfather and father each of whom were practical, trained farmers and simultaneously editors of the distinguished agricultural journal, *Wallace's Farmer*. The slogan, aptly enough, of this family publication is "Good Farming, Clear Thinking, Right Living."

Possessed of a thorough background of scientific agricultural methods and trained in economics and statistics, Mr. Wallace still displays an idealism and romanticism incongruous with his Scotch-Irish descent. As much as this of Mr. Wallace, one must know to comprehend fully the nature of this volume, *New Frontiers*.

In the first of the sections into which this book is divided, Author Wallace pictures in a philosophical vein our present economic status. He indicates the changes that have taken place during the past century in our economic system and their significance. Mr. Wallace insists "that we have now become a mature nation with abundant means of production. The need henceforth is not to learn how to compete with each other for enough of this world's goods but to learn how to live with each other in abundance."

The tariff, this Scotch idealist assails, in the second section of this volume, as a barrier to harmonious living together in a world indivisibly united by economic relationships. As in his justly famed pamphlet, *America Must Choose*, Mr. Wallace recommends a middle-of-the-road course between free trade and high tariffs. He suggests the reduction of tariff duties to a maximum of 50 per cent and the revision of these tariffs with the avowed objective of opening up markets for our export products.

When he comes to the discussion of the AAA, the candor of this man is amazing. Straightforwardly he states that the plowing under of crops and the slaughter of hogs are acts to be tolerated by any sane society only in an emergency. How long such acts must be continued, however, Mr. Wallace does not indicate. "In practice, I am wondering," he writes, "if it will be possible for the president to push his tariff bargaining so rapidly that foreign purchasing power will be sufficiently enlarged five or ten years hence to enable us to do away completely with agricultural control."

In the final section of this book Mr. Wallace turns to the subject of long-run economic planning. Here he discusses the planned "smooth-ing-out" of the business cycle, the planned use of land in production, and the planned balancing of economic groups and interests. All this he pictures practically in the setting of a democracy through the processes of which these ends must be attained.

Many readers who are fundamentally opposed to the agricultural revolution engineered by the AAA and others critical of the whole New Deal will be impressed—if not converted—by a thoughtful reading of this volume. They will not be impressed by the adequacy of the defense of administration policies contained herein, for Mr. Wallace is never on the defensive. They will be impressed by the readable, persuasive, and always thoughtful statement of the philosophy of the new deal this author presents.

JOHN J. CORSON, III.

FASCINATING READING

THE JOURNEY OF THE FLAME. By Antonio Fierro Blanco. Englished by Walter De Steiguer; Illustrations by Alfredo Ramos Martinez. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1933. Pp. xviii, 295. \$3.00.

It seems that there was once upon a time (at least so the title-page avers) a certain Don Juan Obrigón, known in the *Three Californias* as *Juan Colorado* and to the Indians of that region as *The Flame*. This character purports to have been born in Lower California in 1798 and, having seen three centuries change customs and manners, died alone in 1902, with his face turned toward the South. Such is the personage who tells the events set forth in *The Journey of The Flame*, alleging that they took place within the course of one year, a twelve-month of racy and glamorous adventure, zestful turbulence, and epic events that befell during an overland journey from Lower California to San Francisco. The narrator tells this tale as a man of eighty, recalling the great adventure of his adolescent youth with fabulous accuracy of detail and with a memory not a whit tarnished or dimmed by age. To those interested in the past story of the Southwest this will furnish many hours of fascinating reading; the place and proper names alone are a delightful treat. Students and lovers of Indian folklore, legend, tradition, and superstition will find fresh material to feed the flames of their interest in this entrancing, if almost incredible, Odyssey of the Southwest. It is an abundant book, a gorgeous caval-

cade of legendary figures that will leave a taste of salt in the reader's mouth. Whether it be history or not, is *meal from another bag*.

OLAV K. LUNDEBERG.

NORWEGIAN NATIONALISM

NATIONAL ROMANTICISM IN NORWAY. By Oscar J. Falnes. New York: Columbia University Press, 1933. Pp. 399. \$4.00.

To quote from the author's preface, "this book is devoted to an investigation of Norwegian nationalism during the period of romanticism." Since romanticism reached Norway, both as a literary and social phenomenon, a quarter century after its bloomtime in France and England, the period studied is virtually the middle third of the last century.

The historian is everywhere present in the unfolding of this account of a people who find themselves anew in the rediscovery of the old treasures of their earlier culture, language, and literature, which had been all but forgotten during the Danish period. Such a study, to be inclusive in its scope and thoroughly documented in all fields touched upon, could not possibly have been written by one scholar, unless he were at once a trained philologist, a specialist in folklore, and a *littérateur* of parts. As it is, the historian has shouldered the burden with results that are gratifyingly effective and convincing. After all, the searcher for specialized information and opinion, outside the purely social and historical phases of the subject, can find more expert discussion of the linguistic and folkloristic problems turned up in the book.

In an era of flamboyant post-war nationalism, the average student of European history will heave a sigh of relief to read of a nationalism which was concerned not with territorial aggrandizement, boundaries, and armaments, but with the development of an indigenous language and the preservation of its ballads and folklore, in a word, its cultural heritage.

OLAV K. LUNDEBERG.

TEACHING OF MODERN LANGUAGES

EXPERIMENTS AND STUDIES IN MODERN LANGUAGE TEACHING. Compiled for the Committee on Modern Language Teaching by Algernon Coleman. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934. Pp. xi, 367. \$2.75.

The Committee on Modern Language Teaching sponsored by the American Council on Education in 1928 has during the past six years conducted investigations, made surveys, administered tests, and com-

piled reports bearing on many phases of modern language pedagogy. To estimate the importance of the rôle played by this committee in quickening of interest in professional problems among the rank and file of language teachers were indeed a futile speculation; yet some idea of the growth of interest in such problems may be gathered from the fact that sixteen years ago only two annual *bulletins* of local appeal were the sole publications in this country devoted wholly to the subject of modern language teaching, while today there are five regularly issued *journals* (monthly or quarterly) of national scope in this field, not to mention a great many regional publications. Whatever may have been the limitations and defects of modern language teachers individually in the past, certainly it would appear that in the last decade they have as a group become conscious of their mission and have turned to self-examination with a thoroughness that has perhaps at times been almost indiscreet. Such dirty linen as they had was not hung out to dry in the privacy of the cellar, but was displayed bravely in the front yard so that all who passed might see the sorry spectacle and know what a shoddy lot of householders they were. It would be interesting to see the spectacle of other groups such as teachers of science, mathematics, and English parading their poverty in public with the same unconcern and ingenuousness as has been shown by the language people both in print and speech. Certainly, if the way to improvement and regeneration begins with a state of repentance and avowal of unworth, modern language teachers, collectively at least, must be on the road to improvement.

If no other good shall have come out of the efforts of all this investigation and publicity concerning modern language methods and materials, at least there has resulted an aroused professional sense among the workers in the field. Reference here is of course intended only to those language teachers who believe that a teacher is not merely born and carried on to success by a *strong personality*, but becomes an effective and inspiring teacher by dint of study and examination of the immense store of information concerning organization, materials, and achievements now available in this field.

The present volume is then a compilation of studies made by such well-known specialists in language pedagogy as Coleman, Cheydleur, Young, Henmon, Fife, Eaton, and others, each of whom presents chapters on some phase of the investigation, such as: reading vocabularies, developments in the field of testing, frequency lists, syntax counts, and the like. Judging by the content of this volume, even the casual

bystander may see that the reading objective is still the burning bush, or shall we say the pillar of fire? The initial chapter is of considerable interest and significance, being a survey of tendencies in modern language teaching from 1927 to 1933.

OLAV K. LUNDEBERG.

JOHN KEATS

KEATS' CRAFTSMANSHIP. By M. R. Ridley. New York: Oxford University Press, 1934. Pp. vii, 312. \$5.00.

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF JOHN KEATS. Compiled from His Letters and Essays, by Eavle Vonard Weller. Stanford University Press, 1934. Pp. xx, 409. \$5.00.

JOHN KEATS. By B. Ifor Evans. Great Lives Series. London: Duckworth, 1934. Pp. 143. 2s.

JOHN KEATS' ANATOMICAL AND PHYSIOLOGICAL NOTEBOOK, PRINTED FROM THE HOLOGRAPH IN THE KEATS' MUSEUM, HAMPSTEAD. Edited by Maurice Buxton Forman. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1934. Pp. 68. 12s. 6d.

The last year and a half has contributed to our understanding of John Keats a keen study of several of his poems in process of creation, an attempt to make him write his own biography, a brief general interpretation, and a closer view of the poet as a young medical student. Of these the last three are useful enough in their various ways, but the first is of considerably more extensive and durable value.

Mr. Ridley makes a detailed examination of nine of Keats's poems to show his artistic development in his use of his materials, his verse form, and his use of sound as an element of his verse. Such an undertaking requires, and in this case obtains, an extensive knowledge of the literature about Keats, a fine critical sense, and a flexible, strong prose style that can make the necessary fine distinctions and make use of numerous small details with the minimum of tiresomeness.

In showing how Keats's imagination seized upon and unified materials from various sources Mr. Ridley is a pupil of Professor Lowes, and (though his materials were much easier to the extent that Keats's reading was less extensive than that of Coleridge) almost the only really successful one. In other matters of technique he goes beyond Mr. Lowes, who was interested in them only incidentally.

Isabella he analyzes as an example of brilliant floundering. Taking it stanza by stanza and occasionally line by line, he gives Keats due credit for its felicities and a knowledge of its infelicities, but concentrates rather severely on its flaws of sense and taste. *Hyperion* is to him an interesting example of the Miltonic and Shakespearian influences in

Keats's style, sometimes successive and sometimes combined. In tracing the imagery to its sources in Keats's reading and observation, he discounts Lemprière's *Classical Dictionary*, explores fully the other known sources, and adds a new one of his own—the *Celtic Researches*, etc., of Edwin Davies. Making use of the manuscript, the letters, and the various other sources, he traces many passages through their evolution to finished poetry. *Hyperion*, he concludes, was too uncongenial a task for the young poet, who left it unfinished, but learned from it the use of his tools.

Possibly because it offers more manuscripts, together with a considerable variety of background in Keats's reading, *The Eve of Saint Agnes* is of all the poems the one most fully and convincingly illuminated. From such diverse reading as *The Mysteries of Udolpho*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Arabian Nights*, *Paradise Lost*, and a French version of Boccaccio's *Il Filocolo* he accounts for most of the details in the poem, tracing some of them through various manuscript changes. His principal task in analyzing the *Ode to Psyche* is to show more surely than Professor Garrod did in 1926 how the effective stanza of Keats's odes developed from his objections to certain elements in the Shakespearian and Italian sonnet forms. The *Ode to Melancholy* is the basis for a rather routine study of Keats's verbal melody, and *Lamia* serves to demonstrate Keats's finished mastery of metrical form by showing how skilfully he changed Dryden's rhymed couplet to suit his needs.

In general, brilliant is hardly too strong a word to apply to Mr. Ridley's deft use of manuscripts and of small details from a variety of sources to bring out the various stages and elements in the most rapid development of poetic ability in English literary history. Yet he is not totally immune from the faults of his school. In spite of his consciousness that such a method can often tell us only what might very well have happened in a great poet's mind he sometimes seems more like a guide through known regions rather than a professed rationalizer of the unknown. Since the process is synthetic, every brick in the structure must be beyond question.

One wonders if Mr. Ridley has not too generally neglected painting and the plastic arts as sources for Keats's imagery. A single item in this field that he seems to ignore in his analysis of stanza four of *The Eve of Saint Agnes* is Professor V. de S. Pinto's derivation of "The carved angels ever eager-eyed" from a detail of the facade of Keats's old school building, still preserved in the Victor and Albert Museum.

Mr. Evans's little book ranges a more familiar field in trying to say

all that is of primary importance about Keats in less than 150 pages. His problem of judgment and proportion is very well met. His judgment is often refreshingly independent of the biographers on whom he has had to depend for many of his facts. He does not view Leigh Hunt as a little jealous and patronizing toward Keats, as Miss Lowell does, but explains Keats's drifting away from Hunt as entirely his own deliberate intention. More than either Miss Lowell or Sir Sidney Colvin, he recognizes Keats's political radicalism. He differs sharply and sensibly from Matthew Arnold's view of Keats's love for Fanny Brawne. Differing, perhaps unwisely, from former critics (and incidentally from himself) he even explains the Odes as a sublimation of the poet's attitude toward Fanny Brawne at the time. His independence elsewhere, however, does not lead him to differ from the older biographers in the inadequate view of favorable elements in the contemporary and early posthumous criticism of the poet.

Mr. Weller's work is chiefly one of intelligent compilation—bringing together in chronological order all the passages in Keats's life and essays in which he speaks of himself, eliminating other matter extraneous to this purpose, and allowing the poet to explain himself. As a handbook for future biographers and critics the volume will undoubtedly serve a useful function. It is also unusually well illustrated.

It is harder, however, to forecast much real scholarly use for Keats's Notebooks. They possess little to remind us that the young student of surgery was soon to become a great poet. Even Sir Sidney Colvin's statement long ago that an examination of the poet's notebooks suggested that he was a fairly diligent student seems a little dubious to the present reviewer. The tiny flowers sketched into the margin seem almost the only touch of Keats as we know him later. The little volume was perhaps worth printing for the sake of preserving a bit of evidence about a little-known aspect of the poet, and it is to the credit of Mr. Forman that what he thought was worth printing he thought should be printed well and carefully.

NEWMAN I. WHITE.

BYRON EXPLAINED AGAIN

BYRON, ROMANTIC PARADOX. By W. J. Calvert. Chapel Hill, N. C.: The University of North Carolina Press, 1935. Pp. xi, 228. \$2.50.

BYRON. Great Lives Series. By P. C. Quennell. London: Duckworth, 1934. Pp. 144. 2s.

That anyone should attempt to reduce Lord Byron to a single paradox might seem to some a feat of elimination comparable only to

Gideon's; to others it might seem a singularly Procrustean way of treating a richly various and interesting human character. It is not perhaps the best way ever to comprehend even a simple personality, but critics are always doing something of the kind, and Professor Calvert accomplishes his purpose more plausibly than most.

The paradox which Professor Calvert wishes to solve and use as a key for clarifying our knowledge of Byron's personality is simply that a great Romantic should also be a great admirer of Pope. Should we by chance doubt the unmixed purity of Byron's Romanticism and at the same time suspect Pope of having picked up a few Romantic microbes without knowing it—and there are people who have suspected both these things—the paradox would shrink, but the fact would remain that Byron as a critic seems to have one set of values and Byron as a poet a decidedly different set. This is really Professor Calvert's subject, and it is not without significance that he seems in the end to forget the paradox. It looks as if the author played the cuckoo in his own nest and hatched out a dubious thesis and a rather good book.

As Mr. Calvert very satisfactorily portrays him, Byron was an active spirit caught in a web of inactivity, with a native commonsense always warred upon by a Calvinistic determination to be a victim of fate. William Gifford represented the last flowering of the ethical tradition from Pope, and he was Byron's principal model in his first really serious effort as a poet in *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*. It would have rounded out the background a little more fully without much altering anything already said had Professor Calvert here bestowed a passing nod upon several obscure anonymous satirists who were doing the same sort of thing as *English Bards*. The next poem that Byron (and almost he alone) took seriously was *Hints from Horace*, in which an eighteenth-century moral criterion still constitutes his ideal. Professor Calvert does right to insist upon taking this neglected poem seriously. The Eastern poems on which Byron's first popularity was founded were never very seriously regarded by him, because while they partly expressed his Romantic side they did violence to his inherited idea of poetry's true function and worth. Nevertheless, their popularity drew him further in their direction. His exile forced him to abandon his amateurish, "gentlemanly" attitude toward poetry. The Romantic self-expression persisted still, as in *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage*, but his defense of Pope against Bowles showed his real faith, and this faith is preserved in the carefully constructed historical dramas, which are as

much the real Byron as the other and more popular side. In them the old ethical bias and emphasis upon fidelity to fact is as strong as ever, but it is tinged with something of the style by which his more Romantic poetry is characterized. *Don Juan*, with its careful basis of fact, its free rein to his own personality and its full consciousness of traditional rules with an equal willingness to flout them, shows a complete and successful merging of the two sides of the man.

This view of Byron's personality is made to embrace his whole career and all of his more important works. While it may lack some of the novelty foolishly required of theses, it had much of the reasonableness of a good critical discussion. It is supported by an intelligent use of quotations both from Byron and from those who have written about him. Perhaps it is too easily taken for granted that no one will contest the author's constant assumption that Byron was "sincere" and a gentleman, apparently in the American sense. Mr. Drinkwater, whom the author so properly admires, would probably agree, but what about Miss Ethel C. Mayne? Short, copious quotations from Byron's letters are used with considerable persuasive effect, even though anyone acquainted with the impulsive variety of those letters in the mass may still wonder how long it will be before some one else comes along to base other conclusions on excerpts that the present author did not use. That, however, would not be Professor Calvert's fault, but rather the fault of Byron himself, who is too eternally restless to stay long in one pigeon-hole.

Mr. Quennell has no thesis to maintain; his task is to give a brief biographical and critical presentation that in lieu of being comprehensive shall at least seem the result of a comprehensive view. On the whole he succeeds, though he gives the impression of not having enough skepticism about him when he goes to such butts of Byron as Medwin and Trelawny for their impressions. He might also have considered with profit Mr. Drinkwater's account of Byron in Venice before accepting contemporary accounts of Byron's debauchery there without some discount. On the other hand, he develops M. Maurois's lead with singular success in treating the Augusta episode as something under the circumstances not so revoltingly unnatural as it has sometimes appeared.

NEWMAN I. WHITE,

EARLY NINETEENTH-CENTURY REVIEWERS

BENTHAMITE REVIEWING: *The First Twelve Years of the Westminster Review, 1824-1836*. By George L. Nesbitt. New York, Columbia University Press, 1934. Pp. vi, 208. \$2.75.

THE SMITH OF SMITHS: *Being the Life, Wit, and Humour of Sidney Smith*. By Hesketh Pearson. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1934. Pp. 336. \$3.75.

THE REVEREND SIDNEY SMITH. By Osbert Burdett. London: Chapman and Hall, 1934. Pp. 318. 15s.

CHRISTOPHER NORTH (JOHN WILSON). By Elsie Swann. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1934. Pp. viii, 255. 12s. 6d.

The reviewers of the early nineteenth century have acquired a somewhat unjust odium as stupid repressors of genius, so that it is sometimes a surprise to be reminded that some of them led useful and interesting lives outside their critical activities, and even as critics, performed valuable constructive services.

The *Westminster Review*, whose bright young reformers constitute Mr. Nesbitt's subject, very soon reached the status of the third great review of the period. In solid learning and often in style, it was inferior to the *Quarterly* and the *Edinburgh*, but in honesty and courage it was inferior to none. In one of its first numbers James Mill, who was more its guiding genius than Jeremy Bentham, its patron saint, declared war on aristocracy, the clergy, war itself, and the other reviews, to the extent that all were instruments of privilege and therefore opposed to true principle of utility. This principle was the criterion applied to most that appeared in the *Westminster*. For this reason, its reviews are more in the field of government and economics than literature, since literature seemed of doubtful utility to the Benthamites. It is as a result of this point of view that the *Westminster* is conspicuous for its sharply challenging reviews of the Waverley novels because (as Hazlitt had earlier complained) they threw a glamor of attractiveness over the abuses of the past. Why they did not single out Shelley for special notice, since he was one of the few writers who did agree largely with their ideas, is a question Mr. Nesbitt rather slights. Possibly it was because the state of trade was too much their measure of utility and too little Shelley's. And, in fact, there are more incidental references to Shelley than the author takes note of, though one would expect still more from friends of Shelley as Hogg and Peacock, and such admirers as Sir John Bowring and probably Henry Southern.

Bold as the young Philosophical Radicals were for their age in defending the freedom of the press and the rights of women and in

helping reform education and the church, Mr. Nesbitt makes a useful distinction in pointing out that they were by no means radical in the modern sense of the word. Economically they supported the "wage fund" theory and were interested in the laboring man only as a necessary factor in helping bring about the prosperity of English commerce, from which he should be content to benefit by sharing the left-overs. The middle classes were to them all that really counted—and when the middle classes became prosperous enough they erected on the basis of the *Westminster's* materialistic liberalism the Philistinism with which Arnold and Carlyle were later to do battle.

In making clear the part played by the *Westminster Review* in expressing the liberalism of its age, Mr. Nesbitt has furnished a needed volume not only for the student of criticism and journalism, but for the historian as well.

Sidney Smith, in a much more British manner, served the cause of liberalism as well as the Benthamites did. Neither of his two most recent critics pays a great deal of attention to his reviews, perhaps because most of them are outside the main currents of literary or historical interest today, or perhaps because the man is so much more important than his reviews. To Mr. Pearson, Smith is primarily a wit and secondarily a bulwark of liberal commonsense; to Mr. Burdette, he is primarily the sturdy liberal churchman. To neither was it sufficiently evident that Smith's famous witticisms were sometimes unnecessarily coarse or cruel and that his reviews (for instance, the one in which he suggested that all Methodists were lunatic) sometimes too unrestrained. Both render him due credit for his fine spirit of personal independence and his great services in rebuking the Society for the Suppression of Vice and in contributing toward the passage of the Reform Bill much more than his famous story of Mrs. Partington's sweeping back the sea. Of the two books Mr. Pearson's, though inferior in taste and style, is perhaps superior in general interest, largely because of its extensive use of Smith's own words. It furnishes an excellent account of the foundation of the *Edinburgh Review* in which Smith had an important part, and it quotes effectively from many still unpublished letters.

John Wilson, unlike Sidney Smith and the Benthamites, was no reformer, but he was an exceedingly lively person. Miss Swann elaborates what we already knew about the young Wilson who preached sermons from nursery chairs and stole off on fishing expeditions at the age of three, who for years maintained the fervor of his schoolboy love affair and then, like Gibbon, dropped it under stern parental pressure,

who went on such extravagantly long walks, jumped the Cherwall, and fought all the boatmen at Oxford. The wealthy young squire and poet who settled near Wordsworth at Elleray and sought to infect the staid dalesmen with his love of boating and manly sports next appears. So far, Miss Swann has merely repeated the spectacular early history of the man, with some useful minor additions. To his connection with the outrageous early issues of *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* she adds a little more, but perhaps not as much as she might have done had she not treated his career as Professor of Moral Philosophy somewhat more fully than its comparative importance merits.

Her greatest addition, however, is in her revised interpretation of his character. Professor Alan Strout has recently shown a little more fully than Miss Swann the curious double dealing of Wilson's criticism of Wordsworth, to the extent even of anonymously attacking his own anonymous reviews. But Miss Swann, with the help of Wilson's own letters to Alexander Blair (previously unused), makes us see John Wilson from the first as two characters side by side—the self-confident, roystering, Christopher North, carrying all before him with his superb vitality; and the timid, uncertain, and sometimes almost grovelling John Wilson who ran to the friend of his youth to be helped out of nearly all of his numerous difficulties. He picked Blair's brains for some of his reviews, and when he was seeking election to a professorship for which he was totally unfitted he became really abject in his appeals to Blair for help. During the early years of his professorship he was no more than a speaking-trumpet for Blair, yet his own sentimental eloquence and imposing presence carried all before him.

Miss Swann is quite accurate (except in her knowledge of slang) in saying that all the time he was *calling* a bluff. At the time, Wordsworth and his sister, and to some extent Carlyle, saw through his false front. Miss Swann now makes it quite clear to everyone else. Damaging as it is to the old flamboyant Christopher, it is an interesting and important clarification of personality.

NEWMAN I. WHITE.

SLANG

A DICTIONARY OF AMERICAN SLANG. By Maurice H. Weseen. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1934. Pp. xiii, 543. \$2.50.

Mr. Weseen's volume of American slang aims to provide a fairly complete collection of words and expressions classified according to the "principal types," among which one finds: crooks and criminals, hoboes

and tramps, cowboys and westerners, soldiers, theater, radio, and sports.

Turning to the thirty pages devoted to "College Slang," I find myself somewhat embarrassed. For years, it seems, I have been conducting "anguishes," in which there have been "apple polishers," "beetles," "clunks," and "dopes." This, being interpreted, simply means that I have been conducting courses in English in which there have been good students, girls, stupid persons, and unattractive people. "Fire extinguishers", I find, chaperone dances. So be it! If my students employ any sizable portion of this college slang I must admit that for me they speak in unknown tongues.

It is easy to find faults in any slang dictionary. "The skin of one's teeth," I always thought, was an example of the splendid English of the King James Bible, but Mr. Weseen calls the expression slang. "Puke," in the sense of "vomit," likewise, appeared to me to be good English, since Shakespeare used the word in describing the first stage in the seven ages of man. Such examples might be multiplied. There are a few words of established standing in this dictionary—as well as hosts of expressions which most students have accepted as mere Americanisms. On the other hand, there are, of course, many omissions; for example, "tycoon," "get the hook," and "cookie duster." Yet fifteen thousand examples of slang are enough!

Mr. Weseen's dictionary, essentially a cross-section of a verbal avalanche, is an interesting work—more than that, one which will offer the reader many a chuckle. I fancy that Charles Lamb would like the book were he alive.

CLARENCE GOHDES.

A BIOGRAPHY WITH CHARM

MY COUSIN, F. MARION CRAWFORD. By Maude Howe Elliott. Illustrated. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1934. Pp. 312. \$2.50.

Charm, because it is a rare and precious quality in persons or books, should not be granted as a random compliment. It is all the more incumbent upon us to acknowledge its presence. Charm characterizes this and previous biographical work of Mrs. Elliott, and it characterized her cousin Marion Crawford. Only an author of sensitiveness and of experience could have been so deft in conveying that gift to us as she disposes the letters, description, and commentary.

With a pang we realize how quickly must be harvested the aftermath of the culture of the East and the South as variously marked in the 1880's and 1890's. It is impossible to recover the expectancy that

welcomed *Via Crucis* and *In the Palace of the King*. More feasible for us, however, because of Crawford's simplicity and skill in dialogue, is it to live in the spirit of the Italian romances, especially those of the Saracinesca series. Mrs. Elliott approves Ouida's dictum that Crawford "was ever present in his books . . . one felt, after reading them, that one had been in the company of a well bred man of superior gifts." Recent critics imply that a writer with such a temper must be inept or sinful, and thus they preclude their palates from savoring the older nicety. They may miss the facts that Crawford had a sense for the naïve yet subtle simplicity which distinguishes much Italian art, and that though he may be a lesser master, he is the only fairly recent novelist to embody that Italian trait in English. It may be pertinent to inquire whether there is not some literary relationship between Crawford and Paul Heyse.

Among glimpses of Boston, New York, Rome, and Sorrento, Mrs. Elliott gives interesting bits about Samuel Ward, James Bryce, Henry James, Norman Douglas, Viola Allen, and Sarah Bernhardt. There is a delightful anecdote of Hall Caine, who was in Crawford's eyes what we today call a portent. Of the letters, Mrs. Elliott remarks in her vein that they were written fifty years "before the damning phrase 'He takes himself too seriously.'" Crawford revealed his nature and experience in all his writings. Endowed with a venturesome spirit, he threw himself with enormous ardor and inventive power into whatever he undertook. His gift for languages and a liking for "natives" easily got him on good terms with different nationalities. Though he was a home-lover, he sought to regulate life on a princely scale and to make it festive for the whole community. He attempted to do too much, as heroes often do.

E. C. KNOWLTON.

EARLY MARYLAND

THE FOUNDING OF MARYLAND. By Matthew Page Andrews. Baltimore: The Williams & Wilkins Company, 1933. Pp. xii, 367. \$4.50.

Fittingly published at the time of the celebration of the tercentenary of the founding of Maryland, this is a volume which should not frighten the laymen. It is sound historically, and although it covers a comparatively short period of time, it is not overburdened with detail, and the footnotes have been relegated to the end where one may omit them without any great qualms of conscience. Beginning with "a preliminary review of the Elizabethan epoch" and extending to the establishment of

the royal government in 1691, the author discusses the familiar problems of colonial settlement, Indian relations, boundary disputes (particularly with the persistent William Claiborne, Virginia, Pennsylvania; and the Dutch on the Delaware), and the problems of democracy that led to an early difference of opinion between the inhabitants and Cecil Calvert over the interpretation of a clause in the charter, a charter characterized by the "most extraordinary delegation of power granted to any English subject since the creation of the border palatinates of previous centuries." In Maryland, as elsewhere, the Assembly gradually won the concessions which it demanded from the Lord Proprietor.

As was to be expected, the author devotes considerable space to the famous Maryland Toleration Act of 1649 (which title is a misnomer) and endeavors to correct some misunderstandings in regard to that Act. He shows that "the claim that Maryland is entitled to world-wide distinction as the first civil régime to establish freedom of conscience is properly based not upon the *Act Concerning Religion*, but upon the actual practices of the founders and the first colonists." In other words, that the founders of the colony insisted upon the full freedom of thought and religious expression from the very beginning, years before the passage of this act. This freedom the Puritans did not approve, and as the Protestants in the colony increased numerically they took advantage of the Puritan supremacy in England in 1649 and the resulting political discomfiture of the Calverts to fix a legal limitation upon religious freedom. So the Act of 1649 "is clearly a compromise between the toleration consistently practiced by the early colonists (before 1649), on the one hand and, on the other a move for restriction" directed against Unitarians, Jews, and Atheists after 1649.

Thoroughly familiar with his subject, the author discusses the problems of early Maryland in a very realistic manner, marked by maturity of thought and soundness of judgment, although he is a bit dogmatic on occasion. He tends to be discursive at times, usually by way of illustration, and in some places the book is less a history and more a commentary upon the history of the Maryland colony.

R. H. WOODY.

